

---

# COMMUNITY-BASED SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH COASTAL FISHERIES AND FINANCIAL INCLUSION IN SOLOMON ISLANDS AND PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Project Evaluation

30 June 2018

---

Prepared for WWF Australia



**MCC ENVIRONMENTAL**  
Environmental Specialists

**WWF Contract No. 062019**

**Authors:** Gillian Starling, Johanna Johnson and David Welch

MCC Environmental

ABN: 65 701393 097

[www.mccenvironmental.org](http://www.mccenvironmental.org)

Rev No	Date	Owner	Reviewer	Approver
A	1.6.2018	G Starling	J Johnson	
B	3.6.2018	G Starling	D Welch (Technical)	
C	4.6.18	G Starling	S Harrison (Editorial)	
0	5.6.2018	G Starling	A Smith & N Burke (WWF)	
1	22.6.2018	G Starling & J Johnson		

## Acknowledgements

MCC Environmental acknowledge the time and effort from WWF Pacific (Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea) and WWF-Australia country staff who prepared for the evaluation, facilitated all the meetings in a willing and professional manner and provided supporting documentation.

We also acknowledge and thank the project communities for their time and participation in the evaluation.

This publication has been funded by the Australian Government through the Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) and John West Australia. The views expressed in this publication are the author's alone and are not necessarily the views of the Australian Government or John West Australia.

# Executive Summary

MCC Environmental was engaged by WWF-Australia to undertake a projects evaluation of the 'Community-based sustainable development through coastal fisheries and financial inclusion in Solomon Islands, implemented by WWF-Pacific (Solomon Islands)(Project No.: ANCP\_2018-19-ANCP45--PRG9945--PRJ699) and WWF-Pacific (Papua New Guinea)(Project No.: ANCP\_2018-19-ANCP45--PRG9945--PRJ698). The objective of the projects are to improve the livelihoods and food security of coastal fishing communities at two sites: (1) central and north-coast Madang Province, Papua New Guinea (PNG), and (2) central Western Province, Solomon Islands. The projects aim to use innovative and integrated approaches to deliver sustainable fisheries, fisheries resource management, and women's economic empowerment and financial inclusion.

It is a requirement of the Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) project funding that WWF-Australia undertakes independent external evaluations of the projects at least every three years, which should contribute to future project design and analysis. WWF-Australia also require regular external evaluations of large projects to ensure their objectives are met and to guide future activities.

This document reports on the project evaluation as part of these requirements, including:

1. An assessment of the effectiveness of the ANCP/John West projects in achieving their stated objectives, and how they meet the WWF Evaluation Criteria;
2. Recommendations on how to improve the project and suggestions on future direction;
3. An assessment of the management role of WWF-Australia and how they may improve their support of the projects; and
4. Review the effectiveness of the WWF-Netherlands (WWF-NL) funded "WWF-Solomon Islands Small-Scale Fisheries Rights-Based Management Programme" [aka "Strengthening Community Rights-Based Fisheries Management Program"] as a part of the WWF-Pacific (Solomon Islands) ANCP/John West projects' review.

A Traffic Light Report Card was used to assess the project progress against objectives and indicators. Scores ranged from zero to four (0-4), where zero is 'not complete' and 4 is 'very good'. The initial project objectives for both countries were revised by WWF (endorsed by DFAT), as they were found to be unachievable due to the availability of resources, technical capacity and culture. Evaluation of the revised objectives and indicators found that overall there was fair-to-good progress for most, see summary report card (Table E.1). The best progress was in the 'Financial Inclusion' component for both countries, while the 'Community Focused Monitoring' scored lowest in Solomon Islands, and 'Support of Community Based Fisheries Management (CBFM)' for PNG. Despite ongoing engagement challenges and resourcing within the Provincial Government, WWF have continued to engage and build capacity with Provincial Government staff under the WWF-NL project funding in Solomon Islands.

Both countries scored well for the WWF Evaluation criteria; 'Quality of Design' and 'Gender Equity'. 'Quality of Design' scored highly as it has been designed to tackle the key issues faced by communities in the two countries. 'Gender Equity' is an important part of the project and the objective to empower women has achieved some very positive outcomes. All women who were consulted reported feeling more empowered, confident and informed due to their participation in the project.

On another positive note, the WWF-Pacific staff in the Solomon Islands and PNG are professional and engaged. WWF-Australia Senior Marine Manager (Andrew Smith) plays a valuable mentoring and technical support role to the staff.

'Adaptive Management' was not scored highly for either country, largely as the project was not tracked regularly enough to make timely changes to indicators and objectives. Project resourcing and technical capacity of staff influenced the effectiveness of the project. Due to the absence of documented socio-economic monitoring, there was also a low score assigned to the 'Economic Development' criteria.

**Table E.1 Traffic Light Report Card for each objective and indicator for Solomon Island and PNG project sites. Indicators in italics were changed or removed during the review and prior to the final evaluation.**

<b>1. Support CBFM</b>		
<i>One community has finalised and is implementing its CBFM plan; and two new communities have signed Community Agreements to develop CBFM plans</i>	3	<b>3.2</b>
<i>The Spawning Potential Ratios of at least 5 target fish species have improved by at least 5%</i>		
At least one women in each community is actively engaged in the community's fisheries management committee/leadership group	4	
<i>At least two Provincial Fisheries Division Officers engaging and committed to CBFM and the SPS approach resulting from formal partnership</i>	2.5	
<b>2. Financial Inclusion</b>		
Membership of the original seven Savings Clubs is stable or increasing	4	<b>3.6</b>
Number of loans made and repaid are stable or increasing	4	
Number of small business initiatives started increases by at least 5% annually	4	
Sustainability criteria are being applied to microloans	2.5	
<i>Microfinance support and training documentation and guides completed and distributed to target communities and Savings Clubs</i>		
<b>3. Community focused monitoring</b>		
<i>Each target community has at least two active Community Facilitators (one male; one female)</i>		<b>2</b>
<i>Community Facilitators approach to be incorporated into at least 2 new Community Agreements by end of FY2018</i>	2	

<b>1. Support CBFM</b>		
<i>Eleven communities are engaged in CBFM planning, with 5 Community Agreements signed for fully integrated CBFM/Financial Inclusion/Climate Change Adaptation</i>	2	<b>2</b>
The Spawning Potential Ratios of at least 5 target fish species have improved by at least 5%	0	
At least one women in each community is actively engaged in the community's fisheries management committee/leadership group	4	
<b>2. Financial Inclusion</b>		
Membership of the original 12 CBOs is stable and accessing Peoples MicroBank loans	3	<b>2.9</b>
At least three new Savings Groups established in north-coast communities	4	
Sustainability criteria are being applied to microloans	2.5	
<i>'Sustainability case statement' presented to PNG NDB/Peoples MicroBank to influence national microloan criteria</i>		
Small business initiatives started increases by at least 10% on FY2017	2	
<b>3. Community focused monitoring</b>		
<i>Community Facilitators in at least five communities have collected baseline data on at least two target fish species</i>	4	<b>2.5</b>
<i>One community is using SPS approach to inform fisheries management; 4 communities are collecting SPS data to establish baselines</i>	1	

<p>One community is using SPS and other monitoring results to inform CBFM adaptive management</p>	2	
<b>WWF-NL</b>		
<p>By 2018, at least two communities in the central Western Province are applying fair and equitable fisheries co-management based on rights-based approaches resulting in a reduction in unsustainable fisheries practices</p>	3	<b>3.0</b>
<p>By 2018, rights-based fisheries co-management approaches have been adopted by the Western Provincial Government Fisheries and capacity increased for application throughout the central Western Province; and the National Coordinating Committee have endorsed the community rights-based fisheries management approaches. Resources Kit as a core component of the national CBRM+/EAFM framework</p>	3	

**LEGEND:**

<b>4</b>	VERY GOOD
<b>3</b>	GOOD
<b>2</b>	FAIR
<b>1</b>	POOR
<b>0</b>	NOT COMPLETE

---

*“Working with WWF and the women’s savings group has given me confidence I never had, and I now believe that I can make a difference.” Erica, Simbo Savings group*

---

Currently as implemented, one of the most significant challenges of both projects is the weak link between the three objectives of sustainable fisheries, financial inclusion and community monitoring.

From this evaluation, the key recommendations to help facilitate ongoing success are:

- Develop less complex, more realistic project indicators for the next three-year phase.
- Link the financial inclusion indicators to specifically support CBFM activities, such as monitoring and management actions. Indicators should include measures of this link, not just the number of loans or businesses.
- Focusing microfinance loans on developing, promoting and supporting micro-businesses for alternative livelihoods and food security (protein) options, including iFADs.
- Ensuring that new savings groups or loans meet basic CBFM criteria.
- Introducing 'fit for purpose' monitoring tools to support management that is simple for communities to use long-term. Any long-term sustainability of community management requires a structured process that follows the SPC CEAFM Guide (2010).
- Continuation of WWF-Australia or WWF-NL to provide support and/or training to build WWF staff project management, program evaluation and strategic planning skills.

The projects provide an opportunity for WWF to continue to work with communities in sustainable fisheries management to deliver positive, high-impact initiatives. With the adoption of the key recommendations listed above, the evaluation would strongly support any application for ongoing funding by WWF to DFAT or other donors for the next phase of the projects.

# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	2
Executive Summary.....	3
1. Introduction .....	10
2. Evaluation findings.....	15
2.1 Traffic Light Report Cards .....	15
2.2 WWF Evaluation Criteria.....	20
3. Recommendations .....	30
3.1 Short Term Recommendations .....	30
3.2 Relevance and Quality of Design .....	31
3.3 Efficiency.....	32
3.4 Effectiveness .....	32
3.5 Impact .....	33
3.6 Sustainability.....	33
3.7 Adaptive Capacity .....	33
3.9 Economic Development.....	33
3.10 Gender .....	34
4. Overall Lessons Learnt .....	35
4.1 Strengths of the Program.....	35
4.2 Challenges .....	35
4.3 Lessons Learned with Wider Relevance.....	36
5. Conclusions .....	38
6. Annexes.....	39
A. Terms of Reference.....	40
B. Evaluation Plan.....	41
C. Case studies / stories .....	42
Solomon Islands .....	43
PNG .....	47

# 1. Introduction

MCC Environmental was engaged by WWF-Australia to undertake an evaluation of the ‘Community-based sustainable development through coastal fisheries and financial inclusion in Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea’ projects, implemented by WWF-Pacific (Solomon Islands) (Project No.: ANCP\_2018-19-ANCP45--PRG9945--PRJ699) and WWF-Pacific (Papua New Guinea)(Project No.: ANCP\_2018-19-ANCP45--PRG9945--PRJ698). The objective of the projects is to improve the livelihoods and food security of coastal fishing communities at two sites: (1) central and north-coast Madang Province, Papua New Guinea (PNG), and (2) central Western Province, Solomon Islands. The project aims to use innovative and integrated approaches to deliver sustainable fisheries, fisheries resource management, and women’s economic empowerment and financial inclusion.

It is a requirement of the *Australian NGO Cooperation Program* (ANCP) funding that WWF-Australia undertakes independent external evaluations of the projects at least every three years and that these should contribute to future project design and analysis. It is also a WWF-Australia practice to require regular external evaluations of large projects to ensure they are achieving their objectives and to guide future activities. The detailed Terms of Reference of the project evaluation are provided in **Annex A**.

The primary purposes of the evaluation, and contents of the report include:

1. An assessment of the effectiveness of the ANCP/John West projects in achieving their stated objectives, and how they meet the WWF Evaluation Criteria;
2. Recommendations on how to improve the projects and suggestions on future direction;
3. An assessment of the management role of WWF-Australia and how they may improve their support of the projects; and
4. Review the effectiveness of the WWF-Netherlands (WWF-NL) funded “WWF-Solomon Islands Small-Scale Fisheries Rights-Based Management Programme” [aka “Strengthening Community Rights-Based Fisheries Management Program”] as a part of the WWF-Pacific (Solomon Islands) (WWF-Sol Is) ANCP/John West projects’ review. This includes recommendations for improvement and future directions, and the role of WWF NL (including funding opportunities).

The interim evaluation results from the ‘Findings from the Field’ report (MCC 2018) were used by WWF-Australia to support project planning meetings held with WWF-Sol Is and WWF-Pacific (Papua New Guinea) (WWF-PNG) in late April and early-May 2018. The final results of the evaluation (this report) and the planning meetings will guide the design of Phase 3 (anticipated to be three years) and preparation of the FY2019 ANCP ADPlans in May-June 2018.

The WWF-NL will use the findings for future programming and, where needed, adapt their role.

The evaluation methodologies and rationale for approach, including the itinerary, names of key informants and a list of consulted documents are described in **Annex B**.

The evaluation team included Gillian Goby from MCC Environmental and, Johanna Johnson and David Welch from C2O Pacific. The team is well qualified with demonstrated experience in leading similar projects to deliver sustainable fisheries, fisheries resource management and women empowerment in the Pacific region. Each team member has over 20 years’ experience in conservation and development, marine fisheries, socioeconomic assessments, marine resource management and community-based monitoring. The team has also undertaken numerous program evaluations in Melanesia, including the 2015 project evaluation completed for WWF-Australia after Phase 2 of the same project.



All team members have worked in the Solomon Islands and PNG, and have experience in development planning and delivering community-based fisheries management. Gillian was the Project Lead and provided important perspective on how the project has progressed since the last review in 2015. Johanna conducted the evaluation in both Solomon Islands and PNG to ensure consistency between both project sites, and David Welch participated in the PNG evaluation and provided critical fisheries expertise.

## 1.2 Projects Overview

The overall purpose of the projects being evaluated is to improve the livelihoods and food security of coastal fishing communities in central and north-coast Madang Province, Papua New Guinea (PNG), and in central Western Province, Solomon Islands, through innovative and integrated approaches to sustainable fisheries, fisheries management, and women's economic empowerment and financial inclusion.

The overexploitation of reef fish through increased fishing and destructive fishing practices is leading to declining catches and deteriorating coastal ecosystems, as noted in 'Reefs at Risk Revisited in the Coral Triangle'. Protein from fish currently makes up around 75% of the diets of the coastal fishing communities in both countries. In many rural areas of Solomon Islands, consumption of fish is already below the threshold required for good nutrition (35 kg/person/year<sup>1</sup>). Due to rapid population growth in Solomon Islands and PNG, consumption of fish is projected to exceed maximum sustainable production by 2030, posing a serious nationwide threat to their food security<sup>2</sup>. Coastal artisanal fishing communities in PNG are facing similar problems, with approximately 3.5 million people in PNG (half the known population) dependent on fish as their main source of protein. In addition, the threatened reef fish trade makes up at least 50% of the income of PNG coastal communities. Growing human population pressure on marine resources and their habitats is resulting in overexploitation, food insecurity and poverty issues.

The situation is compounded by the invisibility of women's contributions to fisheries and the value chain. This issue is identified in the Pacific as a key obstacle to the effectiveness of sustainable management and to broader development efforts, including the equitable distribution of benefits from coastal fisheries. With increasing pressures on coastal fisheries, the knowledge, perspectives and buy-in of the women engaged in fisheries are crucial to developing viable, long-term, sustainable management systems.

This evaluation is focused on Phase 2 (FY2016 to FY2018) of the projects, which evolved from Phase 1. Phase 2 is funded through WWF-Australia from the ANCP, with co-funding provided by John West Australia and a private donor.

A separate, but complementary project in Solomon Islands is funded by WWF-Netherlands, "Strengthening Community Rights-Based Fisheries Management Programme". This project is included in this evaluation, and was reviewed in conjunction with the Phase 2 ANCP project, "Community-Based Sustainable Development through Coastal Fisheries and Financial Inclusion (Solomon Islands)", as the two projects are being jointly implemented over the three years (FY2016 to FY2018).

### **Phase 1 (FY2013 to FY2015)**

In July 2012, WWF-Australia began supporting and working with WWF-Pacific's PNG Country Office (WWF-PNG) and WWF-Pacific's Solomon Islands Country Office (WWF-Sol Is) to reduce fishing pressure on overfished coral reef and lagoon systems, and to improve the livelihoods and food security of coastal fishing communities. Phase 1 (FY2013 to FY2015) supported two project sites: "Improving livelihoods of coastal artisanal fishing communities through piloting alternative fishing methods" in the Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea.

---

<sup>1</sup> SPC [Secretariat of the Pacific Community] (2008) Fish and Food Security. Policy Brief 1/2008. Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Noumea, New Caledonia.

<sup>2</sup> Bell, J.D., Cisneros-Montemayor, A. Hanich, Q., Johnson, J.E., Lehodey, P. Moore, B.R. et al. (2018) Adaptations to maintain the contributions of small-scale fisheries to food security in the Pacific Islands. *Marine Policy*, 88: 303–314.

Phase 1 was funded through ANCP , with co-funding provided by John West Australia and a private anonymous donor.

Phase 1 in PNG and Solomon Islands focused on: a) establishment of working relationships in the communities and with the government fisheries agencies; b) installing rafters/iFADs (by the communities in Solomon Islands; and by National Fisheries Authority in PNG); c) establishing fisheries and socio-economic monitoring programs and baselines; d) initiating the savings clubs (micro-savings) in Ghizo, and the women's savings community-based organisations (CBOs) in Madang; e) supporting and building the capacity, expansion and sustainability of the micro-financing schemes in both Ghizo and Madang; f) exploring business opportunities especially for women, from the micro-savings and revolving loan funds; g) initiating the trialling of the length-based assessment of fish spawning levels in data-poor small-scale fisheries, now called Spawning Potential Surveys (SPS), to provide indications of fish stocks in Ghizo and options for Madang; and h) continuing to develop, build capacity and apply community-based fisheries co-management with the WWF-Pacific staff, partners and provincial fisheries officers.

An independent external evaluation of the projects conducted in May-June 2015 was critical in shaping the focus of Phase 2 (FY2016 to FY2018). The evaluation found that in both countries, changes were already being seen in the savings culture and fishing practices that could be attributed to the project. The evaluation identified a range of positive outcomes, but also identified areas where the project could be improved. These recommendations were incorporated into the FY2016 work plans and included; strengthening of staffing and management capacity, better integration of project objectives, consolidation and strengthening of activities in current communities (rather than expansion), greater focus on sustainability, and better sharing of lessons learnt and facilitating knowledge transfer in-country.

#### **Phase 2 (FY2016 to FY2018)**

This phase was built on the foundations provided by Phase 1, but evolved through adaptive management into supporting a programmatic approach by WWF-PNG and WWF-Sol Is, encapsulated in their respective Sustainable and Resilient Coastal Communities Programs. These programs utilise three integrated strategies: (1) Sustainable Fisheries – through effective community-based fisheries management, partnerships and innovative management approaches; (2) Sustainable Community Livelihoods – by enhancing community livelihood opportunities through financial inclusion and local women's empowerment; (3) [Sol Is] Ridge-to-Reef Community Planning – through a participatory resource mapping and planning framework; or (4) [PNG] Resilient Coasts – through fostering the adaptation and resilience of coastal communities to climate-change.

The design of Phase 2 involved a deliberate shift towards focusing on strengthening Community-Based Fisheries Co-Management (CBFM), and a shift away from direct support for iFAD deployment. iFADs became one of the management strategies available to communities through the CBFM framework, rather than being a specific project objective as they were in Phase 1.

Using innovative and integrated approaches to sustainable fisheries management, women's economic empowerment and financial inclusion, the project aims to improve the livelihoods and food security of coastal communities in Madang, Bogia and Sumkar Districts of Madang Province, PNG, and in the broader Ghizo islands area, central Western Province, Solomon Islands. Community fishers and leaders are engaged through participating in the Spawning Potential Survey (SPS) approach (which assesses fish spawning potential to indicate stock status) and, where requested, support for inshore Fish Aggregating Devices (iFADs) as a sustainable alternative to reef fishing. The SPS and iFADs provide an opportunity to foster and strengthen Community-Based Fisheries Co-Management to reduce fishing pressure on heavily exploited coastal systems, while still enabling fishers to meet their food and cash needs. To further support livelihoods, and to help fish-dependent households diversify their incomes, women are being engaged through the establishment and support of microfinance systems, catalysing microbusiness initiatives, and the fostering of women's leadership in CBFM. The financial inclusion work is also intended to support the CBFM work, e.g. savings groups are encouraged to allocate some funds to supporting the implementation of the CBFM plans. Additionally, through skills training, community outreach, and technical and policy engagement with the respective provincial

fisheries agencies, the project aims to increase people’s awareness of the importance of women’s roles, experiences and perspectives in CBFM.

The projects also employ male and female Community Facilitators (CFs; more progressed in PNG) from within communities to promote the crucial role that women already play and demonstrate how increasing their agency and leadership can improve the success and sustainability of coastal fisheries. At the formal level, the project leverages partnerships with Provincial authorities to engage and train fisheries officers in more gender-inclusive CBFM approaches, support agencies to integrate these principles into government policy, and promote an increase in the number of women fisheries officers.

**Objectives:** The projects are implementing three integrated 3-year objectives/outcomes in two sites, but with specific modifications and emphasis to meet local circumstances. The following summarises the objectives across the two projects (the site/country specific objectives, outcomes, indicators are attached in the TOR **(Annex A)**).

Note that as part of the 3-year project evaluation, some of the objectives and indicators for each project site were refined to better reflect the local circumstances and external influences on progress. The evaluation is based on the revised objectives and indicators (also provided in **Annex A**).

1. Sustainable coastal fisheries: By 2018 target communities in each country will have measurably improved their livelihoods and food security through innovative approaches to sustainable fisheries and CBFM; training and building local and Provincial/District Fisheries management capacity; community competence to use and manage iFADs; promoting the participation and leadership of women in CBFM; and facilitating peer-to-peer fishers’ and Community Facilitators’ networks/associations.

2. Financial Inclusion: By 2018 livelihood opportunities have ensured the benefits from transitioning to more sustainable fisheries have contributed to improved women’s empowerment, food security and poverty alleviation through consolidation of the Savings Groups/CBOs approach (improved financial literacy, governance, leadership, documentation); training of local trainers; application and embedding of sustainability criteria (environmental; social/ethical; financial); and small business planning and management.

3. Community-focused monitoring: By 2018 communities are making informed CBFM adaptive management decisions based on key data from appropriate community-focused fisheries and socioeconomic monitoring being undertaken and communicated by trained local Community Facilitators, demonstrating the positive results of their shift to more sustainable and effectively managed fisheries and improved women’s financial inclusion.

The two project sites have common cross-cutting focuses on:

- Building local staff/partner capacity—including Provincial/District Fisheries, local CBOs and CFs;
- Improving integration—of the components and with related projects;
- Providing greater emphasis on community-centred monitoring;
- Promoting the participation and leadership of women in CBFM;
- Household income diversification through women’s financial inclusion
- Building peer-to-peer network support;
- Leveraging lessons-learnt to new communities and to inform the national CBFM agenda.

The goals and objectives of the WWF-Netherlands funded project “Strengthening Community Rights-Based Fisheries Management Programme” are summarised as:

**Long Term Goal:** By 2030, the Western Province of Solomon Islands is implementing rights-based approaches to fisheries co-management resulting in the sustainable, fair and legal use of natural resources and improvement in food security and livelihoods.

Six Year Goal: By 2021, the identified rights-based management approaches are being applied, monitored and adaptively co-managed by at least four central Western Province communities in collaboration with government, and are showing demonstrable social, ecological and economic results.

Three Year Goal: By 2018, at least two central Western Province communities have agreed and initiated co-management of fisheries using rights-based management approaches that are supported by a strengthened Western Province Provincial Fisheries Division, resulting in improved status of coastal food fish resources

Objective 1 – Strengthening community rights-based fisheries co-management: By 2018, at least two communities in the central Western Province are applying fair and equitable fisheries co-management based on rights-based management approaches resulting in a reduction in unsustainable fisheries practices.

Objective 2 – Strengthening Government capacity for rights-based fisheries co-management: By 2018, rights-based fisheries co-management approaches have been adopted by the Western Province Provincial Government Fisheries Division and capacity increased for application throughout the central Western Province; and the National Coordinating Committee have endorsed the community rights-based fisheries management approaches Resources Kit as a core component of the national CBRM+ /EAFM framework.

## 2. Evaluation findings

This section provides a summary of the evaluation findings. Firstly, against a 'Traffic Light Report Card', where the projects' progress was scored against their objectives and indicators from zero to four (0-4) where zero is 'not completed' and 4 is 'very good' (Section 2.1). Secondly, an evaluation against the WWF Evaluation Criteria is reported (Section 2.2), where 1 is 'poor' and 4 'very good'.

### 2.1 Traffic Light Report Cards

The initial project objectives for both Solomon Islands and PNG did require modification by WWF as they were found to be unachievable in the current site/country context of available resources, technical capacity, and culture (refer **Table 2.3**). Evaluation of the revised objectives and indicators found that overall there was fair to good progress against most objectives and indicators (**Table 2.1**) in both countries.

In Solomon Islands, the financial inclusion component scored the highest (4), achieving all the original objectives and indicators. However, the evaluation found that this component did lack a connection to the other project objectives. The community-focused monitoring requires the greatest additional focus and effort to link it to the other project components and to effectively provide the information communities need to implement CBFM.

Likewise, the best progress in PNG was also against the Financial Inclusion component, scoring 2.9. Both the other components had mixed progress resulting in lower average scores of 2 for Support CBFM and 2.5 for Community Focused Monitoring. Some of the drivers of these results, including the strengths and weaknesses in each country are discussed further in **Section 4.1** and **4.2**.

The evaluation found the strongest contribution of the WWF-NL funded "WWF-Solomon Islands Small-Scale Fisheries Rights-Based Management Programme" was the engagement and capacity building of the Provincial Government by WWF staff.

**Table 2.1 Traffic Light Report Card for each objective and indicator for Solomon Island and PNG project sites. Indicators in italics were changed or removed during the review and prior to the final evaluation.**

<b>1. Support CBFM</b>		
<i>One community has finalised and is implementing its CBFM plan; and two new communities have signed Community Agreements to develop CBFM plans</i>	3	<b>3.2</b>
<i>The Spawning Potential Ratios of at least 5 target fish species have improved by at least 5%</i>		
At least one women in each community is actively engaged in the community's fisheries management committee/leadership group	4	
<i>At least two Provincial Fisheries Division Officers engaging and committed to CBFM and the SPS approach resulting from formal partnership</i>	2.5	
<b>2. Financial Inclusion</b>		
Membership of the original seven Savings Clubs is stable or increasing	4	<b>3.6</b>
Number of loans made and repaid are stable or increasing	4	
Number of small business initiatives started increases by at least 5% annually	4	
Sustainability criteria are being applied to microloans	2.5	
<i>Microfinance support and training documentation and guides completed and distributed to target communities and Savings Clubs</i>		
<b>3. Community focused monitoring</b>		
<i>Each target community has at least two active Community Facilitators (one male; one female)</i>		<b>2</b>
<i>Community Facilitators approach to be incorporated into at least 2 new Community Agreements by end of FY2018</i>	2	

<b>1. Support CBFM</b>		
<i>Eleven communities are engaged in CBFM planning, with 5 Community Agreements signed for fully integrated CBFM/Financial Inclusion/Climate Change Adaptation</i>	2	<b>2</b>
The Spawning Potential Ratios of at least 5 target fish species have improved by at least 5%	0	
At least one women in each community is actively engaged in the community's fisheries management committee/leadership group	4	
<b>2. Financial Inclusion</b>		
Membership of the original 12 CBOs is stable and accessing Peoples MicroBank loans	3	<b>2.9</b>
At least three new Savings Groups established in north-coast communities	4	
Sustainability criteria are being applied to microloans	2.5	
<i>'Sustainability case statement' presented to PNG NDB/Peoples MicroBank to influence national microloan criteria</i>		
Small business initiatives started increases by at least 10% on FY2017	2	
<b>3. Community focused monitoring</b>		
<i>Community Facilitators in at least five communities have collected baseline data on at least two target fish species</i>	4	<b>2.5</b>
<i>One community is using SPS approach to inform fisheries management; 4 communities are collecting SPS data to establish baselines</i>	1	

<p>One community is using SPS and other monitoring results to inform CBFM adaptive management</p>	2	
<b>WWF-NL</b>		
<p>By 2018, at least two communities in the central Western Province are applying fair and equitable fisheries co-management based on rights-based approaches resulting in a reduction in unsustainable fisheries practices</p>	3	
<p>By 2018, rights-based fisheries co-management approaches have been adopted by the Western Provincial Government Fisheries and capacity increased for application throughout the central Western Province; and the National Coordinating Committee have endorsed the community rights-based fisheries management approaches. Resources Kit as a core component of the national CBRM+/EAFM framework</p>	3	<b>3.0</b>

**LEGEND:**

4	VERY GOOD
3	GOOD
2	FAIR
1	POOR
0	NOT COMPLETED

## 2.2 WWF Evaluation Criteria

WWF have six core evaluation criteria that they use to review project progress and strategic value. The tables below provide a summary of the findings of the evaluation for each of the six criteria for both Solomon Islands (**Table 2.3**) and PNG (**Table 2.4**). The Evaluation found that in the Solomon Islands and PNG the projects scored well against most criteria, with the highest scoring against the following:

- **Relevance:** The project/programme addresses the necessary factors in the specific programme context to bring about positive changes around sustainable fisheries and women's empowerment.
- **Quality of design:** The project design addresses the necessary factors to bring about positive changes in conservation targets. However, there are some on-ground implementation challenges, discussed further in **Section 4.2**.
- **Gender:** This project has had a very positive impact on gender and the perceived status of women. The Community Facilitators (CF) role in PNG has empowered women to have a greater voice in community meetings and decision-making. The case studies (**Annex C**) provide a good illustration of this.

The key Issues in Solomon Islands and PNG relevant to the WWF evaluation criteria included:

- Quality of Design. The (original) project objectives were also found to be too complex, particularly for the country context where engaging with communities and raising awareness on issues, such as sustainable fisheries management, takes a long time and a lot of trust. It was unrealistic to expect that multiple communities would have developed management plans in only three years. Similarly, collecting sufficient SPS data to inform local management requires a lot of fish samples and time to analyse the data, which could not be achieved in three years and is an indication of both an unrealistic indicator and too complex method.
- The current CBFM Monitoring requires considerable technical knowledge and effort. It is considered too technical for communities, largely as data is needed to be sent away and results can take some time before being made available to communities. The design should be simplified.
- Adaptive Management of the project did not score very highly as the evaluation found that the project was not tracked regularly enough to make timely changes to indicators and objectives. More regular (independent audits) may assist with identifying issues earlier on.
- Adequate project resourcing and technical capacity of staff has been a challenge in both countries and has influenced the effectiveness of the projects by delaying the start of activities and ability to complete tasks without additional external support.
- A lack of documenting progress and project successes has hindered the effectiveness of the projects as well as the ability to share lessons learnt between project sites.
- Economic Development: was scored lower due to the absence of documented information to assess these criteria. In particular, there were limited records on how many micro-businesses had been established due to the project, the types of micro-businesses or period surveys to track loan or business progress. No periodic data meant it was not possible to establish the contribution of the project to household incomes.



**Table 2.3** WWF Evaluation Criteria Scoring for Solomon Islands.

Criteria	Description of Strong Performance	Evaluator Rating/ Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
<b>Relevance</b>	The project/programme addresses the necessary factors in the specific programme context to bring about positive changes in conservation targets – biodiversity and/or footprint issues (i.e. species, ecosystems, ecological processes, including associated ecosystem services supporting human wellbeing).	3.5	The project addresses the necessary factors in the specific programme context to bring about positive changes around sustainable fisheries and women’s empowerment.
<b>Quality of Design</b>	1. The project/programme has rigorously applied key design tools (e.g. the WWF PPMS).	3.5	The project design is good. However, the implementation on the ground is challenging. More realistic time frames are required to achieve these types of objectives (especially involving community engagement).
	2. The project/programme is hitting the right ‘pressure points’ to meet necessary and sufficient conditions for success.	3	As above.
<b>Efficiency</b>	1. Most/all programme activities have been delivered with efficient use of human & financial resources and with strong value for money.	2	There is a need to strengthen the technical capacity (in CBFM) in country staff. Program leadership is also challenging.  There was a very clear absence of a link between the project components.
	2. Governance and management systems are appropriate, sufficient, and operate efficiently.	2/3	More regular assessment and adaptive management is required to promote better efficiency.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	1. Most/all intended outcomes—stated objectives/intermediate results regarding key threats and other factors affecting project/programme targets—were attained.	3	While most activities had commenced, few are complete and many are behind prescribed timelines
	2. There is strong evidence indicating that changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the WWF project or programme.	3	Yes, some changes can be largely attributed to the project. Especially micro-financing and a shift in thinking around CBFM.
<b>Impact</b>	1. Most/all goals—stated desired changes in the status of species, ecosystems, and	2/3	There was a reasonable/good progress against the revised

Criteria	Description of Strong Performance	Evaluator Rating/ Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
	ecological processes—were realised.		project objectives. The initial objectives were not realistic in the location and with the technical capacity to deliver.
	2. Evidence indicates that perceived changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the WWF project or programme.	3	There is evidence that perceived changes can be attributed to the project e.g. micro-financing components and women's empowerment.
<b>Sustainability</b>	1. Most or all factors for ensuring sustainability of results/impacts are being or have been established.	2/3	There are some factors to help support sustainability. Working with Prov Gov, Developing Resource Kit, Partnering with WWF-Australia for technical and leadership.
	2. Scaling up mechanisms have been put in place with risks and assumptions re-assessed and addressed.	2	The project is not considered ready to scale up. There would be more value in refining the project model and resourcing prior to making any changes here.
<b>Adaptive Management</b>	1. Project/programme results (outputs, outcomes, impacts) are qualitatively and quantitatively demonstrated through regular collection and analysis of monitoring data.	2	Project objectives were revised but there would have been benefit doing this earlier in the project.  More regular Monitoring & Evaluation is required with routine assessment of progress against each indicator on a 6-monthly basis recommended.
	2. The project/programme team uses these findings, as well as those from related projects/ efforts, to strengthen its work and performance.	2	The interim report from the evaluation was shared with project staff and changes made to improve performance. However there would have been benefit in trying to do this earlier in the project.
	3. Learning is documented and shared for project/programme and organisational learning.	2/3	While there are reports documenting progress they are brief and do not provide any detail or learnings. The learning are then not incorporated into the country activities. The interim report from the evaluation was shared with project staff and changes made to improve performance.
<b>Gender</b>	1. At the community level, have the projects had impacts on gender relations and/or the perceived roles or status of women?	4	Yes. This project has had a very positive impact on gender and the perceived status of women.

Criteria	Description of Strong Performance	Evaluator Rating/ Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
	2. At the government level, has there been an increase in capacity and willingness to consult with women as well as men, and to respond to women's needs and priorities?	D/I	This is not applicable.
	3. At the government level, have the projects contributed to an increase in the number of women fisheries officers, or meaningful efforts to recruit/appoint/promote more female fisheries officers?	D/I	This is not applicable.  However the Western Prov Gov reported seeing how WWF involve women which has a positive influence.
	4. Overall, have practical and strategic gender interests been adequately considered in the projects' design and implementation? If so, how and to what effect?	4	Yes.
<b>Economic Development</b>	1. Have the projects increased, diversified or otherwise changed household incomes?	D/I	No data available.
	2. Are households more, less or equally dependent on coastal fishing than they were when the projects started?	D/I	No data available.
	3. Are economic benefits distributed equitably among community members, or are there notable concentrations of benefits?	3	No data was available. However women reported that the money they earned and saved went to support school fees, the church, and medical clinics.
<b>Participation</b>	1. Have provisions been made in the projects' designs and implementation to ensure that people with disabilities are able and encouraged to participate?	3	The project is open to all participants but there is not necessarily provisions to encourage minority groups (e.g. disabilities to participate). Focus on gender equity.  The project team use drama to engage youth with positive results.
	2. Are there any other social groups for whom provisions have been made to facilitate participation?	DI	Not able to be addressed as part of the evaluation.
	3. Are there any groups that are excluded from participating in the projects? If so, why and have efforts been made to address their exclusion?	3	There were no groups that had been intentionally excluded from the project. Rather all training, information sessions etc. were open to all the community.
	4. Have the projects included the implementation and promotion of safe and discrete complaints/feedback mechanisms that are accessible to all stakeholders?	D/I	This was not possible to assess.

**KEY:**

- **Very Good/4:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *very good* extent.
- **Good/3:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *good* extent.
- **Fair/2:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *fair* extent.
- **Poor/1:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *poor* extent.
- **N/A:** The criterion was *not assessed* (in the 'Justification,' explain why).
- **D/I:** The criterion was considered but *data were insufficient* to assign a rating or score (in the 'Justification,' elaborate).

**Table 2.4** WWF Evaluation Criteria Scoring for PNG.

Criteria	Description of Strong Performance	Evaluator Rating/ Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
<b>Relevance</b>	The project/programme addresses the necessary factors in the specific programme context to bring about positive changes in conservation targets – biodiversity and/or footprint issues (i.e. species, ecosystems, ecological processes, including associated ecosystem services supporting human wellbeing).	4	The project addresses the necessary factors in the specific project context to bring about positive changes around sustainable fisheries and women's empowerment.
<b>Quality of Design</b>	1. The project/programme has rigorously applied key design tools (e.g. the WWF PPMS).	4	This was not assessed, but WWF Australia (A Smith) confirmed that PPMS was the basis for the design.
	2. The project/programme is hitting the right 'pressure points' to meet necessary and sufficient conditions for success.	2	The monitoring method used is not suitable to the local context in that communities require evidence of the need before developing CBRM planning and the method requires considerable monitoring effort, is too technical for communities, data is needed to be sent away and results can take some time before made available to communities.
<b>Efficiency</b>	1. Most/all programme activities have been delivered with efficient use of human & financial resources and with strong value for money.	2	The WWF Madang team have relevant technical capacity but not all project activities have been delivered due to issues with the approach.
	2. Governance and management systems are appropriate, sufficient, and operate efficiently.	2	Better communication and technical exchanges among project teams (Solomon Islands and PNG) has

Criteria	Description of Strong Performance	Evaluator Rating/ Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
			the potential to greatly improve efficiency.
<b>Effectiveness</b>	1. Most/all intended outcomes—stated objectives/intermediate results regarding key threats and other factors affecting project/programme targets—were attained.	2	Some necessary adjustments have been made to outputs, and some indicators were unrealistic however many indicators remain incomplete.
	2. There is strong evidence indicating that changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the WWF project or programme.	2	Due to many incomplete indicators this cannot be demonstrated.
<b>Impact</b>	1. Most/all goals—stated desired changes in the status of species, ecosystems, and ecological processes—were realised.	2	Most Financial Inclusion goals were realised, however most Sustainable Coastal Fisheries and Community focused monitoring goals were not realised due to inappropriate monitoring tools and unrealistic indicators.
	2. Evidence indicates that perceived changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the WWF project or programme.	2	Limited evidence as indicators are incomplete and documenting evidence isn't regularly done.
<b>Sustainability</b>	1. Most or all factors for ensuring sustainability of results/impacts are being or have been established.	2	The strong CF network and trainings are working towards this but slow progress on community-based management and an expert-dependent monitoring tool prohibits sustainability at this stage.
	2. Scaling up mechanisms have been put in place with risks and assumptions re-assessed and addressed.	2	This is based on there being Community Facilitators in place and a strong Train the Trainer platform but more evidence of reassessment is needed.
<b>Adaptive Management</b>	1. Project/programme results (outputs, outcomes, impacts) are qualitatively and quantitatively demonstrated through regular collection and analysis of monitoring data.	1	No apparent monitoring of progress towards achieving objectives and indicators.
	2. The project/programme team uses these findings, as well as those from related projects/efforts, to strengthen its work and performance.	1	No learnings from WWF-Sol Is sought.
	3. Learning is documented and shared for project/programme and organisational learning.	1	No evidence of this, e.g. business initiatives not documented.
<b>Gender</b>	1. At the community level, have the projects had impacts on gender relations and/or the	4	CF has empowered women to have a greater voice in

Criteria	Description of Strong Performance	Evaluator Rating/ Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
	perceived roles or status of women?		community meetings and decision-making.
	2. At the government level, has there been an increase in capacity and willingness to consult with women as well as men, and to respond to women's needs and priorities?	n/a	Willingness to attend WWF meetings perceived to be based on success with microfinance, e.g. Peoples Bank and NDB recognise empowerment of women project is achieving. Not measured however.
	3. At the government level, have the projects contributed to an increase in the number of women fisheries officers, or meaningful efforts to recruit/appoint/promote more female fisheries officers?	n/a	Project not in a position to influence government HR procedures.
	4. Overall, have practical and strategic gender interests been adequately considered in the projects' design and implementation? If so, how and to what effect?	4	Micro-financing.
<b>Economic Development</b>	1. Have the projects increased, diversified or otherwise changed household incomes?	1	Undocumented until socio-economic data is analysed – may increase once results are available.
	2. Are households more, less or equally dependent on coastal fishing than they were when the projects started?	1	Undocumented until socio-economic data is analysed – may increase once results are available.
	3. Are economic benefits distributed equitably among community members, or are there notable concentrations of benefits?	3	Potentially too soon to know; however the project has provided greater capacity and organisation within communities that has generated wide benefits, e.g. Sagar resource centre.
<b>Participation</b>	1. Have provisions been made in the projects' designs and implementation to ensure that people with disabilities are able and encouraged to participate?	n/a	While there are no specific provisions, the project engages widely with communities and doesn't exclude anyone.
	2. Are there any other social groups for whom provisions have been made to facilitate participation?	n/a	Nothing specific to engage.
	3. Are there any groups that are excluded from participating in the projects? If so, why and have efforts been made to address their exclusion?	4	Everyone can participate and everyone is involved in community meetings. Strong leadership so all village involved.
	4. Have the projects included the implementation and promotion of safe and discrete	3	Main mechanism is via CF to report, not major issues as CF represent clans and leadership group manages

Criteria	Description of Strong Performance	Evaluator Rating/ Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
	complaints/feedback mechanisms that are accessible to all stakeholders?		minor issues. Minor complaints about timing of results have been dealt with.

# 3. Recommendations

Below are a series of recommendations organised against each of the six WWF core evaluation and social and economic development criteria. The rationale for the recommendations are based on the evaluation findings from **Section 2**. Each recommendation is deliberately specific and actionable. The recommendations will be considered as part of the AD Planning for 2019.

## 3.1 Short Term Recommendations

The short-term recommendations were made in the Field Reports that were provided to each project site immediately following the evaluation visits. They were developed as easily actioned items that can be implemented in the short-term to address key deficiencies in the project. While they have driven the revision of some objectives and indicators and will inform the Phase 3 work plan, they were intended for the 2017/18 year (Phase 2) and it is strongly recommended they are actioned.

No. Recommendation		SI	PNG	Actioned
ST 1	Provide WWF staff with a refresher on the conceptual project diagram so that they can understand the linkage between the three objectives and provide this information to communities.	✓	✓	✓
ST 2	WWF to fund and hold a workshop with MFMR, NCC and other NGOs developing community-based Management Plans to discuss the expectations for such plans, the process and what they need to include. This will be an opportunity to ensure that everyone is working consistently towards the same goals. Consider an external facilitator.	✓	✓	Process started for July 2018 meeting
ST 3	Introduce 'fit for purpose' monitoring tools to support management that is simple for communities to use long-term without dependence on external experts, and provides more immediate results to inform management decisions and assess the effectiveness of actions.	✓	✓	Included in the FY19 proposals.
ST 4	Outsource analysis of last 2 years of socio-economic data to prepare a report before 30 June 2018 that reviews whether any changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the project. This significant dataset can also be used to support and inform future project activities.		✓	✓
ST 5	Ecological Solutions Solomon Islands (and WWF staff who assisted with the socio-economic surveys in 2015) should repeat the socio-economic surveys using the <b>exact</b> same questionnaire to allow a direct comparison of household data from 3 years ago and determine if the project has wholly or partly contributed to any positive changes.	✓		✓
ST 6	Consider engaging external contractors (with appropriate community based EAFM experience and knowledge) to provide training and capacity building to WWF and community Facilitators (e.g. Train the Trainers) on community based monitoring to inform management.	✓	✓	No funding available
ST 7	Provide refresher training to WWF staff (and then communities) on EAFM. Highlight similarity of CBRM (it is not a new thing), and that fisheries management should be following the EAFM approach (as per SPC Guidelines 2010).	✓	✓	✓
ST 8	Microfinance loans should focus on developing, promoting and supporting small businesses for alternative livelihoods and food security (protein) options, including iFADs. A small levy should be established under the savings groups to fund community-based management and monitoring to further support sustainable project outcomes.	✓	✓	✓
ST 9	Continue to support the agreement by the Savings Club Peer-to-Peer Management group to impose a levy on all the savings clubs that can be	✓		✓



	used for supporting CBFM implementation, amongst other actions. 2.			
ST 10	Prioritise the completion of the Resources Kit (which should also include training and guidelines on CBFM as well as Micro-financing components). This could also be ‘presented/shared’ at the WWF workshop suggested above (2).	✓		✓
ST 11	Facilitate immediate progress on community-based management using available SPS and other information to implement local actions that apply basic fisheries management (EAFM) and will benefit a range of species and habitats.	✓	✓	✓

The following recommendations (**Sections 3.2 – 3.9**) are organised by WWF evaluation criteria, and are intended as longer term actions that can inform the design and work plan for Phase 3 of the projects in both the Solomon Islands and PNG sites.

## 3.2 Relevance and Quality of Design

RECOMMENDATION		SI	PNG
2a	Provide WWF country staff a refresher on the conceptual project diagram so that they (and the communities) can understand the linkage between the project components/objectives (i.e. the financial inclusion supports the CBFM projects, and the monitoring allows for adaptive management and to demonstrated the project is working (or not)..	✓	✓
2b	2.b Develop less complex, more realistic project indicators for next three-year phase as discussed with input from WWF staff, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rather than expand community management planning to additional communities (which progress to date shows is unrealistic), focus on the existing communities that have draft CBFM Plans or agreements to develop plans and use the experience to prepare lessons learnt, guiding and template documents.</li> <li>- Provide training to Community Facilitators, Provincial Government and other key project partners on how to use and implement the CBFM Guide and template.</li> <li>- Partner with Solomon Islands MFMR to use the two existing communities with draft CBFM plans as test cases as part of the government initiative to spend 12-months ‘field testing’ plans before gazetted under the Act.</li> <li>- Link the program with existing and new government programs/policy e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Women’s Policy in Western Province that includes financially empowering women and including women in resource management decisions;</li> <li>ii. Gender policy;</li> <li>iii. MSSIF – MFMR capacity building.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
2c	WWF has built a strong foundation to do EAFM, however any long-term sustainability of community management requires a structured process that follows the SPC CEAFM Guidelines (2010). Management implementation needs to be supported by alternative livelihood and food options and appropriate community monitoring tools that empower communities for sustainable and informed decision-making and for tracking effectiveness of management actions.	✓	✓
2d	Deliver comprehensive awareness-raising and education in communities about the critical need to implement local actions that apply basic fisheries management (EAFM) through a range of appropriate media, including (but not limited to) the SPC CEAFM Guidelines (2010), the Fish & People DVD series, local stories from village elders.	✓	✓

2e	The financial inclusion project objectives indicators should link specifically to supporting CBFM activities such as monitoring and management actions (and indicators should include measures of this link not just the number of loans/businesses).	✓	✓
2f	New savings groups or loans meet basic CBFM criteria. For example, loans will be provided only where the community has in place or has an agreement to work towards establishing a fisheries management committee or community-based management plan.	✓	✓
2g	Provide communities with savings groups with training and education about alternative food and livelihoods so that when a business is established there is an understanding and link to reducing fishing pressure on the reef (reports from participants suggest this was not the case). Likewise, when communities implement fisheries management arrangements (e.g. banning fishing of an important income generating fish species) they consider alternative income sources through the micro-financing component.	✓	✓

### 3.3 Efficiency

RECOMMENDATION		SI	PNG
3a	Include greater resources for communication, partnerships and regular team exchanges between project sites in work plans with explicit funding allocated for next 3-year phase.	✓	✓
3b	WWF-NL to provide funding to support a Conservation Manager type role in Solomon Islands to work with the Country Manager to help provide ongoing technical guidance across projects.	✓	
3c	Where there are not appropriately qualified National consultants, allocate funding for external consultants to provide technical and program management support to WWF and national consultants as required (WWF-NL). There was also some concern that the WWF pay scale was too low to attract suitable in-country expertise so external contractors may need to be considered for key activities where this is the case.	✓	✓
3d	Staff capacity building should be an essential milestone/output in every external contract (e.g. requirement for external experts to deliver knowledge and skills to WWF staff and work directly with them and Community Facilitators thereby enhancing their future capacity).	✓	✓

### 3.4 Effectiveness

RECOMMENDATION		SI	PNG
4a	Select use of one term (suggest CBRM to be consistent with the NPoA) and not to confuse communities with multiple terms. It is important that staff and communities understand the similarities in CBRM, EAFM and MPA Management. Also the regional move towards EAFM (not single fisheries management). This is also important so communities know that the previous work they have done (e.g. MPA Plans under the Protected Area Act) will provide useful information and were not a waste of time.	✓	✓
4b	Include greater resources for communication, partnerships and regular team exchanges between project sites in work plans with explicit funding allocated for next 3-year phase.	✓	✓
4c	WWF to organise a project site exchange between Gizo and Madang staff to share lessons and assist each other in activities where one site is progressing well but the other is behind. For example, the Gizo site could learn a lot from the Madang team about Community Facilitators and how their role works,	✓	✓

	while sharing their knowledge on the micro-financing with the Madang team.		
--	--	--	--

## 3.5 Impact

RECOMMENDATION		SI	PNG
5a	Deliver comprehensive awareness-raising and education in communities about the critical need to implement local actions that apply basic fisheries management (EAFM) through a range of appropriate media, including (but not limited to) the SPC CEAFM Guidelines (2010), the Fish & People DVD series, local stories from village elders.	✓	✓
5b	Consolidate the community monitoring approach/method and ensure it is simple enough for communities to sustain long-term and inform local decision-making.	✓	✓
5c	There needs to be a clearer link between how communities can use the monitoring data so they can make adaptive management decisions.	✓	✓

## 3.6 Sustainability

RECOMMENDATION		SI	PNG
6a	Long-term sustainability of the project outcomes as well as scaling up mechanisms will depend on effective and continued engagement with National, Provincial Fisheries and District administration as key delivery partners. Therefore, work plans need to align and in order to achieve this, the WWF approach may need to adjust project indicators/outputs to be consistent with National, Provincial and District objectives.	✓	✓
6b	WWF to participate in District planning meetings as an identified key implementing partner for Madang District and align work plan and future community-based plans with District approach to feed into formal District planning process.		✓
6c	Incorporate engagement with NFA and communication products that target national audience in next 3-year work plan to promote greater national focus on coastal fisheries and scaling up to more communities in PNG.		✓

## 3.7 Adaptive Capacity

RECOMMENDATION		SI	PNG
7a	WWF Australia to facilitate more inclusive project reviews so all WWF staff are involved and can contribute to tracking project progress and are supported for adaptive management if required.	✓	✓
7b	WWF Australia to provide additional support and/or training to build WWF staff project management, program evaluation and strategic planning skills.	✓	✓
7c	Have an action plan on how to prioritise and implement some of the key recommendations from both this evaluation and the previous evaluation (MCC 2015).	✓	✓

## 3.9 Economic Development

RECOMMENDATION		SI	PNG
	Outsource analysis of last two years of socio-economic data to prepare a		✓

9a	report before 30 June 2018 that reviews whether any changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the project. This significant dataset can also be used to support and inform future project activities.		
9b	Socio-economic surveys should repeat the <b>exact</b> same questionnaire done previously to allow a direct comparison of household data over time.	✓	
9c	Engage external contractors (with appropriate socio-economic experience and knowledge) to provide training and capacity building to WWF and community Facilitators (e.g. Train the Trainers) on socio economic monitoring to inform management.	✓	✓

### 3.10 Gender

10. The increased burden on women's time is very much a result of culture (in many societies), and a difficult one to address. The only suggestion the authors can make is to start to include the men in the savings clubs so that the work load can be shared. It is unlikely in either Solomon Islands or PNG that the men will take on some of the other domestic/family tasks that the women also do. Education and awareness about shared roles may have some positive impact for some families.

# 4. Overall Lessons Learnt

This section provides an overview of the lessons learnt as experienced and shared by WWF staff, and those noted during the evaluation. This includes some of the key strengths and challenges associated with the program, and those lessons that have a wider relevance beyond the project.

## 4.1 Strengths of the Program

- The program design was scored highly against the WWF evaluation criteria as it has been developed to tackle the key issues faced by communities in the two countries, especially sustainable fisheries. The broader focus from just iFADs (from 2015) to include community-based fisheries management has also been important for delivering sustainable fisheries.
- The financial inclusion component of the project has achieved some very positive outcomes. All women who were consulted reported feeling more empowered, confident and informed due to their participation in the project. Gender equity is an important part of the project and the role of female Community Facilitators and women's savings groups do not appear to be an issue in terms of jealousy from husbands. The village savings groups in PNG include men, women and youth and everyone is supportive of the savings scheme.
- The WWF-Pacific staff are professional and engaged. They have strong community liaison skills and experience and demonstrated that they are committed to working closely with communities to achieve positive outcomes. As a result, they have built strong relationships with the communities they continue to work with.
- Despite ongoing engagement challenges and resourcing within the Provincial Government, the WWF staff have ensured they are engaged and included where possible. This partnership approach is needed to ensure long-term sustainability of project activities.
- The community engagement and awareness component in the WWF-Madang project site is strong, underpinned by the network of Community Facilitators who are reasonably well trained and very motivated. It is a highly effective mechanism for engaging with communities and delivering awareness-raising, local management and monitoring. The real strength of this project is this strong community engagement and participation platform, which is a sound basis to deliver improvements in community-based management in the next phase. It is important that planning for the next three years builds on this success and provides support for the Community Facilitators network to progress sustainable community-based fisheries.

## 4.2 Challenges

- Currently as implemented, one of the most significant challenges is the weak link between the three project objectives of sustainable fisheries, financial inclusion and community monitoring. As a result, the objectives of the individual program components are compromised. For example, the 'Financial Inclusion' objective is currently not supporting the 'Sustainable Fisheries' or 'Community Monitoring' objectives. Also, the 'Community Monitoring' objective is substantially behind and the planned activities to address this were found not to actually inform community-based monitoring or management decisions (i.e. to deliver Community Management Plans).
- Informed by both the WWF staff and the evaluation, the project 'Indicators' are either unrealistic, too prescriptive, or not representative of the work being undertaken. They were considered very ambitious and didn't necessarily reflect what can be realistically achieved with community-based activities that require significant education and awareness raising before change can be implemented. However, there was a recommendation to review this in the interim evaluation report and these have been revised by WWF as a result.

- There is confusion with staff and community about what is CBFM. In particular, how it overlaps with CBRM, EAFM and MPA Management. The technical capacity (and relevant years of experience particularly in CBFM) of country staff to implement the project, and to provide accurate and appropriate technical advice to communities was also limited.
- Many of the project objective 'indicators' were found not to be on track and adaptive management had not been occurring rapidly enough to rectify issues (e.g. resourcing, technical requirement etc.). Ideally, quarterly tracking should identify where indicators are behind or not being met, and some measures put in place to address this or to adjust the indicator if it is unrealistic. The overall project management needs to be strengthened.
- Many of the project indicators cannot be accurately scored, in particular, those relating to whether the project has wholly or largely contributed to on-ground changes. This is partly due to the fact that there hasn't been analysis of the socio-economic data for the last two years, which is critical to be able to measure impact of the project in communities.
- The available evidence, including samples collected by this project, suggests that the current coastal fisheries situation in the project areas is critical due to overfishing, particularly in Madang, and that immediate community-based EAFM is needed. Communities have been waiting for SPS data or implementing their own *ad hoc* actions without strategic guidance (e.g. establishing tambu areas that are too small, setting size limits on long lived species). There needs to be more immediate actions informed by the available data and relevant expertise to address this.

## 4.3 Lessons Learned with Wider Relevance

- Community-based actions take a lot of awareness-raising and time to engender the necessary ownership for change. Designing, developing and implementing programs in the Pacific needs more consideration of country complexities, including staffing, technical capabilities and community aspirations. Donors should understand the reality of working in these locations and that overly complex objectives and requirements don't necessarily deliver tangible outcomes.
- Ongoing capacity development and leadership are required to support the WWF-Pacific country offices in implementing multi-country ('global') projects.
- Both the WWF-PNG and WWF-Sol Is project teams are working to deliver the same objectives and indicators, and each team has different yet complementary skills and expertise. Significant learnings and efficiencies, as well as consistency between project sites, could be achieved from greater direct project communication and exchanges (in person or remotely). In addition, promoting the project and measuring the impact would demonstrate the benefits of the projects to communities and partners, and provide evidence that the projects have delivered on-ground change.
- The evaluation found that there is an increase in work/burden for women as a result of the micro-financing component. Women now also manage the household finances, the business and continue to run their households (e.g. gardening, children, cooking etc.). However, every women participant would still report that the benefits far outweigh any increased burden.
- There was no reported backlash against women's empowerment. Rather women participants found the men were supportive of the project and encouraged their participation.
- Strength of partnerships has also contributed significantly to delivery (for example with World Vision, Divine Word University) and there is further scope to improve engagement with Provincial government, particularly fisheries. The project is well respected in both countries.
- The SPS method provides an excellent visual aid to community members to be able to highlight poor fishing practices, mostly the disproportionate capture of immature (small) fish. This promotes awareness about overfishing generally and the need for management, providing evidence to maximize the likelihood of

positive community change. It also provides a cost-effective method for assessing current stock status to inform and support management intervention. However, the SPS method is highly technical, can take considerable time to catch the required sample size for each species (minimum 200), requires complex analysis and results have taken a long time to be available for communities. Critically, data must be sent away for external entry and analysis, which not only increases the time for the turnaround of results but also takes away ownership from communities and undermines long-term sustainability of community-based monitoring. For these reasons we deem it to be inappropriate as a community-based monitoring tool, particularly over the long term when project support won't be available.



# 5. Conclusions

This evaluation has provided important information on the ability of the project to meet its aims and objectives in order to improve its current performance and continue to make positive future outcomes. The lessons learned from the project have both project-specific and wider relevance implications, with key recommendations stemming from these.

The evaluation found that the initial country objectives for both countries did require modification by WWF as they were found to be unachievable in the current site/country context of available resources, technical capacity and culture. Evaluation of the revised objectives and indicators found that overall there was fair-to-good progress for most of them.

The project scored a range of values against the WWF core evaluation criteria, with both countries scoring well for 'Relevance: Quality of Design' and 'Gender Equality'. For both countries 'Adaptive Management' was not scored very highly, largely as the projects were not tracked regularly enough to make timely changes to indicators and objectives. Project resourcing and technical capacity of staff in both countries affected the effectiveness of the projects. Due to the absence of documented socio-economic monitoring/information there was also a low score assigned to the 'Economic Development' criteria.

The project design was scored highly for the WWF evaluation criteria, as it has been designed to tackle the key issues faced by communities in the two countries. Gender equity is an important part of the projects and the objective to empower women has achieved some very positive outcomes. The WWF-Pacific country staff in Solomon Islands and PNG are professional and engaged. WWF-Australia Senior Marine Manager (Andrew Smith) plays a valuable support role to the staff.

From the evaluation, the key recommendations made to help facilitate success in ongoing years include:

- Developing less complex, more realistic project indicators for next three-year phase.
- Linking the financial inclusion project objectives indicators to specifically support CBFM activities, such as monitoring and management actions. Indicators should include measures of this link not just the number of loans/businesses.
- Focusing microfinance on developing, promoting and supporting small businesses for alternative livelihoods and food security (protein) options, including iFADs.
- Ensuring that new savings groups or loans meet basic CBFM or environmental criteria.
- Introducing 'fit for purpose' monitoring tools to support management that is simple for communities to use long-term. Any long-term sustainability of any community management requires a structured process that follows the SPC CEAFM Guidelines (2010).
- Continuation of WWF-Australia or WWF-NL to provide support and/or training to build WWF staff project management, program evaluation and strategic planning skills.

This project provides an opportunity for WWF to continue to work with communities in sustainable fisheries management to deliver positive, high-impact initiatives. With the adoption of the key recommendations listed above, the evaluation would strongly support any application for ongoing funding by WWF to DFAT or other donors for the next phase of this project.



# 6. Annexes

- A. Terms of Reference
- B. Evaluation Plan
- C. Case studies / stories (~300-500 words with 1 or 2 illustrative images)

# A. Terms of Reference

## WWF Australia

### Evaluation of the Community-Based Sustainable Development through Coastal Fisheries and Financial Inclusion in Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea Projects

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Community-Based Sustainable Development through Coastal Fisheries and Financial Inclusion in Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea</b>
<b>Project Locations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Papua New Guinea:</b> central and northern Madang Province</li> <li>• <b>Solomon Islands:</b> Ghizo islands region, central Western Province</li> </ul>
<b>Project Reference Number(s)</b>	<p><b>DFAT ANCP:</b> ANCP45--PRG9945--PRJ698 (PNG) ANCP45--PRG9945--PRJ699 (Solomon Islands)</p> <p><b>John West Australia:</b> WWF-A Agreement 0312-SIM-CON SI17</p> <p><b>WWF-NL:</b> Project NL: 200910 / Project Int'l SB201300</p>
<b>Names of Project Executants (WWF Office, name of project manager)</b>	<p>WWF-Pacific (PNG) – Ms Rebecca Samuel</p> <p>WWF-Pacific (Solomon Islands) – Mr Shannon Seeto</p> <p>WWF-Australia project manager – Dr Andrew Smith</p>
<b>Project (from start year)</b>	<p>Phase 1: July 2012 to June 2015</p> <p>Phase 2: July 2015 to June 2018</p>
<b>Period to Be Evaluated</b>	Phase 2: July 2015 to June 2018
<b>Project Budget Sources and Amounts (for period to be evaluated)</b>	<p><b>PNG: AUD 718,090</b> (DFAT = \$542,706; John West = \$175,384)</p> <p><b>Sol Is: AUD 1,261,748</b> (DFAT = \$323,628; John West &amp; WWF-AU private donors = \$234,337; WWF-NL CBFM project = \$703,783)</p>

#### PROJECT OVERVIEW

The overall purpose of the projects to be evaluated is to improve the livelihoods and food security of coastal fishing communities in central and north-coast Madang Province, Papua New Guinea (PNG), and in central Western Province, Solomon Islands, through innovative and integrated approaches to sustainable fisheries, fisheries management, and women's economic empowerment and financial inclusion.

The overexploitation of reef fish, through increased fishing and destructive fishing practices, is leading to declining catches and to deteriorating coastal ecosystems, as noted in 'Reefs at Risk Revisited in the Coral Triangle'<sup>1</sup>. Protein from fish currently makes up around 75% of the diets of the coastal fishing communities in both countries. In many rural areas of Solomon Islands, consumption of fish is already below the threshold required for good nutrition. Due to rapid population growth in Solomon Islands, consumption of fish is projected to exceed maximum sustainable production by 2030, posing a serious nationwide threat to their food security<sup>2</sup>. Coastal artisanal fishing communities in PNG are facing similar problems, with approximately 3.5 million people in PNG (half

<sup>1</sup> Burke, L., Reyntar, K., Spalding, M. and Perry, A. and contributing authors Knight, M., Kushner, B., Starkhouse, B., Waite, R. and White, A. 2012. **Reefs at Risk Revisited in the Coral Triangle**. World Resources Institute

<sup>2</sup> Bell, J.D., Kronen, M., Vunisea, A., Nash, W.J., Keeble, G., Demmke, A., Pontifex, S., and Andrefouet, S. (2009) **Planning the use of fish for food security in the Pacific**. *Marine Policy* 33:64 – 76. doi: 10.1016/j.marpol.2008.04.002

the known population) dependent on fish as their main source of protein. In addition, the threatened reef fish trade makes up at least 50% of the income of PNG coastal communities. Growing population pressure on marine resources and their habitats is resulting in over-exploitation, food security and poverty issues.

The situation is compounded by the invisibility of women's contributions to fisheries, identified<sup>3</sup> in the Pacific as a key obstacle to the effectiveness of sustainable management and to broader development efforts, including the equitable distribution of benefits from coastal fisheries. With increasing pressures on coastal fisheries, the knowledge, perspectives and buy-in of the women engaged in fishing are crucial to developing viable, long-term, sustainable management systems.

This evaluation is focused on the Phase 2 (FY2016 to FY2018) projects which evolved from the Phase 1 projects.

Phase 2 is funded through WWF-Australia from the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) under the Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP), with co-funding provided by John West Australia and a private donor.

A separate, but complementary project in Solomon Islands, is funded by WWF-Netherlands, "Strengthening Community Rights-Based Fisheries Management Programme". This project is included in this evaluation, and needs to be reviewed in conjunction with the Phase 2 DFAT ANCP project, "Community-Based Sustainable Development through Coastal Fisheries and Financial Inclusion (Solomon Islands)", as these two projects are being implemented conjointly over the 3 years (FY2016 to FY2018).

### **Phase 1 (FY2013 to FY2015)**

In July 2012, WWF-Australia began supporting and working with WWF-Pacific's Papua New Guinea Country Office (WWF-PNG) and WWF-Pacific's Solomon Islands Country Office (WWF-Sol Is) to reduce fishing pressure on overfished coral reef and lagoon systems, and to improve the livelihoods and food security of coastal fishing communities. Phase 1 (FY2013 to FY2015) supported two projects: "Improving livelihoods of coastal artisanal fishing communities through piloting alternative fishing methods" in the Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea. These Phase 1 projects were funded through WWF-Australia from the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) under the Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP), with co-funding provided by John West Australia and a private anonymous donor.

The Phase 1 projects in PNG and Solomon Islands focused on: a) the establishment work in the communities and with the government fisheries agencies; b) installing rafters/iFADs<sup>4</sup> (by the communities in Solomon Islands; and by National Fisheries Authority in PNG); c) establishing fisheries and socio-economic monitoring programs and baselines; d) initiating the savings clubs (micro-savings) in Ghizo, and the women's savings community-based organisations (CBOs) in Madang; e) supporting and building the capacity, expansion and sustainability of the microfinancing schemes in both Ghizo and Madang; f) exploring business opportunities especially for women, from the micro-savings and revolving loan funds; g) initiating the trialling of the length-based assessment of

---

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Pacific Island Forum Fisheries Agency & Secretariat of the Pacific Community *Future of Fisheries: a regional roadmap for sustainable fisheries* (<http://www.spc.int/coastfish/en/publications/467>)

<sup>4</sup> Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs), are devices used to attract pelagic fish (such as bonito, tuna and rainbow runner) in one location to make them easier to catch. 'Rafters' (as they are referred to in Solomon Islands), or inshore/nearshore FADs (iFADs) are FADs that are anchored to the sea floor, close to the coast to allow access for coastal communities by paddle canoes or small boats. They have a dual purpose of enhancing subsistence and artisanal fishers' ability to catch fish (to improve livelihoods and enhance food security) and to shift fishing effort from depleted or vulnerable reef species to the less exploited nearshore pelagic fish.

spawning levels in data-poor small-scale fisheries, now called Spawning Potential Surveys (SPS<sup>5</sup>), to provide indications of fish stocks in Ghizo and options for Madang; and h) continuing to develop, build capacity and apply community-based fisheries co-management with the WWF staff, partners and provincial fisheries officers.

An independent external evaluation of the projects<sup>6</sup> conducted in May-June 2015 was critical in shaping the focus of the Phase 2 (FY2016 to FY2018) projects. The evaluation found that in both countries changes were already being seen in the savings culture and fishing practices that could be attributed to the projects. The evaluation identified a range of positive outcomes, but also identified areas where the projects could be improved. These recommendations were incorporated into the FY2016 work plans, and included: strengthening of staffing and management; better integration of project objectives; consolidation and strengthening of current communities rather than expansion; focus on sustainability, and; better sharing of lessons learnt and facilitating knowledge transfer in-country.

### **Phase 2 (FY2016 to FY2018)**

This phase was built on the foundations provided by Phase 1, but evolved through adaptive management into supporting a programmatic approach by WWF-PNG and WWF-Sol Is, encapsulated in their respective *Sustainable and Resilient Coastal Communities Programs*. These programs utilise three integrated strategies: (1) Sustainable Fisheries – through effective community-based fisheries management, partnerships and innovative management approaches; (2) Sustainable Community Livelihoods – by enhancing community livelihood opportunities through financial inclusion and local women’s empowerment; (3) [Sol Is] Ridge-to-Reef Community Planning – through a participatory resource mapping and planning framework; and (4) [PNG] Resilient Coasts – through fostering the adaptation and resilience of coastal communities to climate-change.

The design of Phase 2 involved a deliberate shift towards focusing on strengthening Community-Based Fisheries Co-Management (CBFM), and a shift away from direct support for iFAD deployment. iFADs became one of the management strategies available to communities through the CBFM framework, rather than being a specific project objective as they were in Phase 1.

Using innovative and integrated approaches to sustainable fisheries, fisheries management, women’s economic empowerment and financial inclusion, the projects are improving the livelihoods and food security of coastal communities in Madang, Bogia and Sumkar Districts of Madang Province, PNG, and in the broader Ghizo islands area, central Western Province, Solomon Islands. Community fishers and leaders are engaged through participating in the Spawning Potential Survey (SPS) approach (which assesses fish spawning potential to indicate stock status) and, where requested, support for inshore Fish Aggregating Devices (iFADs) as a sustainable alternative to reef fishing. The SPS and iFADs provide an opportunity to foster and strengthen Community-Based Fisheries Co-Management to reduce fishing pressure on heavily exploited coastal systems, while still enabling fishers to meet their food and cash needs. To further support livelihoods, and to help fish-dependent households diversify their incomes, women are being engaged through the establishment and support of microfinance systems, catalysing microbusiness initiatives, and the fostering of women’s leadership in CBFM. The financial inclusion work is also intended to support the CBFM work, e.g. savings groups

---

<sup>5</sup> For background: Prince, J., Hordyk, A., Valencia, S. R., Loneragan, N., and Sainsbury, K. (2014) **Revisiting the concept of Beverton–Holt life-history invariants with the aim of informing data-poor fisheries assessment**. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsu011. Hordyk, A., Ono, K., Sainsbury, K., Loneragan, N., and Prince, J. (2014) **Some explorations of the life history ratios to describe length composition, spawning-per-recruit, and the spawning potential ratio**. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, doi:10.1093/icesjms/fst235. Hordyk, A., Ono, K., Valencia, S., Loneragan, N., and Prince, J. (2014) **A novel length-based empirical estimation method of spawning potential ratio (SPR), and tests of its performance, for small-scale, data-poor fisheries**. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsu004.

<sup>6</sup> Goby, Gillian. 2015. **Improving livelihoods of coastal artisanal fishing communities in PNG and Solomon Islands through piloting alternative fishing methods. Project Evaluation - FINAL Report, June 2015**. MCC Environmental Consultants Pty Ltd ([www.mccenvironmental.org](http://www.mccenvironmental.org))

are encouraged to allocate some funds to supporting the implementation of the CBFM plans. Additionally, through skills training, community outreach, and technical and policy engagement with the respective provincial fisheries agencies, the projects aim to increase people's awareness of the importance of women's roles, experiences and perspectives in CBFM.

The projects also employ male and female Community Facilitators (CFs; further developed in PNG) from within communities to promote the crucial role that women already play and demonstrate how increasing their agency and leadership can improve the success and sustainability of coastal fisheries. At the formal level, the projects leverage partnerships with Provincial authorities to engage and train fisheries officers in more gender-inclusive CBFM approaches, support agencies to integrate these principles into government policy, and promote an increase in the number of women fisheries officers.

**Objectives:** The projects are implementing three similar integrated three-year objectives/outcomes in the two countries, but with specific modifications and emphasis to meet local circumstances. The following summarises the objectives across the two projects (the project specific objectives/outcomes/outputs and key stakeholders are attached in **Annexes 1 and 2**):

**1. Sustainable coastal fisheries:** By 2018 the five target communities in each country will have measurably improved their livelihoods and food security through innovative approaches to sustainable fisheries and CBFM; training and building local and Provincial/District Fisheries management capacity; community competence to use and manage iFADs; promoting the participation and leadership of women in CBFM; and facilitating peer-to-peer fishers' and Community Facilitators' networks/associations.

**1.1 PNG and Sol Is:** By 2018, at least five communities [in each country] are sustainably fishing and effectively managing their fisheries within a CBFM framework, contributing to improved livelihoods and food security.

**2. Financial Inclusion:** By 2018 livelihood opportunities have ensured the benefits from transitioning to more sustainable fisheries have contributed to improved women's empowerment, food security and poverty alleviation through consolidation of the Savings Groups/CBOs approach (improved financial literacy, governance, leadership, documentation); training of local trainers; application and embedding of sustainability criteria (environmental; social/ethical; financial); and small business planning and management.

**2.1 PNG:** By 2018, at least 15 Savings Groups/CBOs are financially strong, well governed, have contributed to the establishment of small-business initiatives, and improved women's empowerment and livelihoods.

**2.1 Sol Is:** By 2018, at least seven Savings Clubs are financially strong, well governed, have contributed to the establishment of small business initiatives, and improved women's empowerment and livelihoods.

**3. Community-focused monitoring:** By 2018 communities are making informed CBFM adaptive management decisions based on key data from appropriate community-focused fisheries and socioeconomic monitoring being undertaken and communicated by trained local Community Facilitators, demonstrating the positive results of their shift to more sustainable and effectively managed fisheries and improved women's financial inclusion.

**3.1 PNG and Sol Is:** By 2018, local partners are implementing community-focused fisheries and socioeconomic monitoring and providing targeted awareness and communication of results that enable communities to understand the positive economic/environmental impacts of more sustainable fisheries and women's financial inclusion.

These projects have common cross-cutting focuses on:

- Building local staff/partner capacity—including Provincial/District Fisheries, local CBOs and CFs;

- Improving integration—of the components and with related projects;
- Providing greater emphasis on community-centred monitoring;
- Promoting the participation and leadership of women in CBFM;
- Household income diversification through women’s financial inclusion
- Building peer-to-peer network support;
- Leveraging lessons-learnt to new communities and to inform the national CBFM agenda.

The goals and objectives of the WWF-Netherlands’ funded project “**Strengthening Community Rights-Based Fisheries Management Programme**”<sup>7</sup> are (see **Annex 3** for details):

**Long Term Goal:** By 2030, the Western Province of Solomon Islands is implementing rights-based approaches to fisheries co-management resulting in the sustainable, fair and legal use of natural resources and improvement in food security and livelihoods.

**Six Year Goal:** By 2021, the identified rights-based management approaches are being applied, monitored and adaptively co-managed by at least four central Western Province communities in collaboration with government, and are showing demonstrable social, ecological and economic results.

**Three Year Goal:** By 2018, at least two central Western Province communities have agreed and initiated co-management of fisheries using rights-based management approaches that are supported by a strengthened Western Province Provincial Fisheries Division, resulting in improved status of coastal food fish resources

**Objective 1 - Strengthening community rights-based fisheries co-management:** By 2018, at least two communities in the central Western Province are applying fair and equitable fisheries co-management based on rights-based management approaches resulting in a reduction in unsustainable fisheries practices.

**Objective 2 - Strengthening Government capacity for rights-based fisheries co-management:** By 2018, rights-based fisheries co-management approaches have been adopted by the Western Province Provincial Government Fisheries Division and capacity increased for application throughout the central Western Province; and the National Coordinating Committee have endorsed the community rights-based fisheries management approaches Resources Kit as a core component of the national CBRM+<sup>8</sup>/EAFM framework

## EVALUATION PURPOSE AND USE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE

It is a requirement of the DFAT ANCP funding that WWF-Australia undertakes independent external evaluations of the projects at least every 3 years and that these should contribute to future project design and analysis. It is also a WWF-Australia practice to require regular external evaluations of large projects to ensure they are achieving their objectives and to guide future activities.

The primary purposes of the evaluation are to:

1. Assess the effectiveness of the DFAT ANCP/John West projects in achieving their stated objectives;

<sup>7</sup> Operational project title shown. Original WWF-Netherlands project proposal title: “**WWF-Solomon Islands Small-Scale Fisheries Rights-Based Management Programme**”.

<sup>8</sup> Community-Based Resources Management + designates an approach to community based adaptive management that incorporates food security, ecosystem approaches to resource management, vulnerability and adaptation planning and protection of key species and habitats. The design of this approach, support materials, supportive policy and capacity building represents the integration or mainstreaming of all these sectors into a more realistic and achievable delivery suited to the characteristics of Solomon Island rural communities. CBRM+ is a term coined for the Solomon Islands National Plan of Action for the Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security. [Alexander, T., Manele, B., Schwarz, A., Topo, S. and Liliqeto, W. 2011. *Principles for best Practice for Community-Based Resource Management (CBRM) in Solomon Islands*. CTI-CFF/CTSP.

2. Provide recommendations on how to improve the projects and suggestions on their future direction;
3. Assess the management role of WWF-Australia and how WWF-Australia may improve their support of the projects;
4. Review the effectiveness of the WWF-NL funded “WWF-Solomon Islands Small-Scale Fisheries Rights-Based Management Programme” [aka “Strengthening Community Rights-Based Fisheries Management Program”] as a part of the WWF-Sol Is DFAT ANCP/John West projects’ review including recommendations for improvement and future directions, and the role of WWF NL.

The evaluation will not require a detailed financial review as WWF-Australia has been closely monitoring the financial aspects of the projects and is confident that the financial reports from WWF-PNG and WWF-Sol Is are a true and accurate reflections of the financial state of affairs.

The evaluation results will be used in WWF-Australia to support project planning meetings to be held with WWF-Sol Is and WWF-PNG in late April and early-May 2018. The results of the evaluation and the planning meetings will guide the design of Phase 3 (anticipated to be 3 years) and preparation of the FY2019 DFAT ANCP ADPlan in May-June 2018.

The WWF-NL will use the findings for future programming and, where needed, adapt their role.

Key people related to the evaluation process are listed below. These people form the internal ‘evaluation review group’:

WWF-Australia contacts:

- Dr Andrew Smith, Senior Manager, Marine Sustainable Development ([asmith@wwf.org.au](mailto:asmith@wwf.org.au); +61(0)400201001)
  - Co-manager of the evaluation process; design; contract management; report review, response and approval
- Nat Burke, Policy Manager, Asia-Pacific Sustainable Development ([nburke@wwf.org.au](mailto:nburke@wwf.org.au); +61(0)402305737)
  - Co-manager of the evaluation process; design; report review, response and approval
- Kathryn Michie, Public Sector Partnerships Manager ([kmichie@wwf.org.au](mailto:kmichie@wwf.org.au))
  - Evaluation design; report review, response and approval

WWF-Netherlands contacts:

- Carol Phua, Senior Marine Advisor ([cphua@wwf.nl](mailto:cphua@wwf.nl); +31 639764599)
  - Report review, response and approval
- Gunilla Kuperus, Senior Advisor Science and Learning, [gkuperus@wwf.nl](mailto:gkuperus@wwf.nl)
  - Report review, response and approval

WWF-Pacific:

- Ms. Kesaia Tabunakawai, Representative [CEO], WWF-Pacific (Fiji office) ([ktabunakawai@wwfpacific.org](mailto:ktabunakawai@wwfpacific.org); +679 331 5533 ext. 126)
  - Report review and approval
- Mr Francis Areki, Director-Conservation, WWF-Pacific (Fiji office), ([fareki@wwfpacific.org](mailto:fareki@wwfpacific.org); +679 7828065)
  - Report review and approval
- Mr Shannon Seeto, Country Director WWF-Pacific Solomon Islands Office, Honiara, Solomon Islands ([sseeto@wwfpacific.org](mailto:sseeto@wwfpacific.org); +677 28023)
  - Facilitation of in-country evaluation; report review, response and approval
- Mr Kafuri Yaro, Programme Development Manager, WWF-Pacific PNG Country Office ([kyaro@wwfpacific.org](mailto:kyaro@wwfpacific.org); + 675 422 1337/8)
  - Facilitation of in-country evaluation; report review, response and approval
- Ms Rebecca Samuel, Marine Officer WWF-Pacific (PNG) ([rsamuel@wwfpacific.org](mailto:rsamuel@wwfpacific.org);



+67572636675)

- o Facilitation of in-country evaluation; report review, response and approval

## Scope of the Evaluation

### Period under review:

- FY2016 to FY2018 (July 2015 to June 2018)

### Solomon Islands projects included (by donor name/proposal):

- **DFAT ANCP:** “Community-Based Sustainable Development through Coastal Fisheries and Financial Inclusion (Solomon Islands)”
- **John West Australia & Private donor:** “Improving Livelihoods of Coastal Communities in Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands through Sustainable Fisheries and Financial Inclusion: John West Community Fisheries Fund”
- **WWF-Netherlands:** “WWF-Solomon Islands Small-Scale Fisheries Rights-Based Management Programme” [aka “Strengthening Community Rights-Based Fisheries Management Programme”]

### PNG projects included (by donor name/proposal):

- **DFAT ANCP:** “Community-Based Sustainable Development through Coastal Fisheries and Financial Inclusion (Papua New Guinea)”
- **John West Australia & Private donor:** “Improving Livelihoods of Coastal Communities in Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands through Sustainable Fisheries and Financial Inclusion: John West Community Fisheries Fund”

Table below shows the relationships of the various donor projects with the country programs and strategies.

Program	Strategies	Projects	Donor Projects	Evaluation Focus
PNG Sustainable and Resilient Coastal Communities	Sustainable Fisheries	CBFM	DFAT ANCP	✓
			John West	✓
	Sustainable Community Livelihoods	Financial inclusion	DFAT ANCP	✓
			John West	✓
Resilient Coasts	Coastal communities' climate change resilience	UNDP/CCDA Climate Change Adaptation Fund	*	
Sol Is Sustainable Coastal Communities	Sustainable Fisheries	CBFM	DFAT ANCP	✓
			John West	✓
			WWF-NL	✓
	Sustainable Community Livelihoods	Financial inclusion	DFAT ANCP	✓
			John West & Private Donor	✓
Ridge-to-Reef Community Planning	Ridges to Reef Planning	CEPF	*	

## EVALUATION CRITERIA AND GUIDING QUESTIONS

The evaluation of the projects should focus on development impacts and overall management. The evaluation criteria and guiding questions are in two parts: the first focuses on assessing the projects against the WWF Network Program Standards' six recommended evaluation criteria<sup>9</sup>; and the second against development and social criteria. The 'guiding questions' are to help direct the consultant's

<sup>9</sup> For greater detail, see WWF Program Standards, step 5.3

[http://wwf.panda.org/what\\_we\\_do/how\\_we\\_work/programme\\_standards/](http://wwf.panda.org/what_we_do/how_we_work/programme_standards/) (or download the document directly from [http://assets.panda.org/downloads/evaluation\\_terms\\_of\\_reference.doc](http://assets.panda.org/downloads/evaluation_terms_of_reference.doc))

evaluation, but are not intended to be answered completely.

**WWF Network Program Standards' recommended evaluation criteria and guiding questions:**

1. **Relevance and Quality of Design:** A measure of the extent to which the project design represents a necessary, sufficient, appropriate, and well-founded approach to bring about positive changes in the targets (e.g. species, ecosystems, ecological processes, human wellbeing).
  - 1.1. **Focal targets and related goals (species, ecosystems, ecological processes, including associated human wellbeing):** Is there a clear and relevant definition of the ultimate success in terms of improved status of the targets, including human wellbeing?
  - 1.2. **Relevance to context, priorities of stakeholders, and objectives:** Have the projects focused on and do they remain relevant to issues of highest priority?
  - 1.3. **Suitability of strategic approach:** Is the theory of change clear? Have the projects taken and will they continue to take the best, most efficient strategic approach?
  - 1.4. **Relevance to WWF priorities:** Do the projects make a clearly aligned and meaningful contribution to attaining WWF's Global Goals and Drivers?<sup>10</sup>
  - 1.5. **Relevance to WWF niche:** Given WWF's priorities and what it is most needed to do, are the projects doing what they should do?
  - 1.6. **Adherence to WWF-Australia social policies:** How well has the social context been understood by the project teams?
2. **Efficiency:** A measure of the relationship between outputs—the products or services of the intervention—and inputs—the human and financial resources the intervention uses.
  - 2.1. **Financial and administrative resources:** Are the financial and administrative resources adequate, with appropriate administrative and financial policies and practices being followed?
  - 2.2. **Use of time:** Are there thorough, well founded work plans being implemented according to plan, monitored, and adapted as necessary?
  - 2.3. **Human resources:** Are human resources appropriate, adequate, efficiently organised and operating effectively (e.g. include considerations of capacity needs and gaps, communications, division and clarity of roles and responsibilities, processes for evaluation and improvement)?
  - 2.4. **Resource use:** Are the projects delivering value for money in that costs are reasonable given the outputs and outcomes generated?
3. **Effectiveness:** A measure of the extent to which the intervention's intended outcomes—its specific objectives or intermediate results—have been achieved.
  - 3.1. **Planned result verses achievement:** Focusing on stated objectives, desired outcomes, and intermediate results (as opposed to delivery of activities and outputs), what has and has not been achieved (both intended and unintended)?
  - 3.2. **Significance of progress:** What is the significance/strategic importance of the progress—or any lack thereof—made to date? To what extent have targeted key factors—drivers, opportunities, threats—been affected to the degree they need to be to achieve the stated goals?
  - 3.3. **Factors affecting effectiveness:** Which strategies are proving to be effective, and which are not? What anticipated and unanticipated factors have promoted or impeded the projects'

---

<sup>10</sup> WWF's Global Goals and Drivers: [http://wwf.panda.org/what we do/how we work/our global goals/](http://wwf.panda.org/what_we_do/how_we_work/our_global_goals/)

progress? What supporting or impeding factors might affect successful implementation in the next planning period?

- 3.4. **Coordination and communication:** To what extent has coordination/communication been effective within and between the implementation teams, stakeholders, partners and participants? Are there well developed internal and external communications strategies being implemented to good effect (e.g. providing reach and/or spread)? What factors have hindered good communication and coordination? What could be done differently to improve this?
- 3.5. **Improving effectiveness:** What lessons can be taken and applied to improve effectiveness in the coming years?
4. **Impact:** A measure of all significant effects of the conservation intervention, positive or negative, expected or unforeseen, on target issues.
  - 4.1. **Evidence of change:** To what extent have the projects attained their stated goals, in terms of outcomes effecting positive change? Discuss observed impacts at all appropriate scales (local, national, regional, global, and present evidence).
  - 4.2. **Attribution:** How confident can we be that perceived changes can be attributed to WWF's activities? What is the likelihood that these changes would have occurred in the absence of the projects?
  - 4.3. **Unforeseen consequences:** Were there any unforeseen impacts (whether positive or negative)? Could anything have been done differently to repeat or avoid these unforeseen consequences and to have acknowledged them earlier as emerging consequences? Have the identified risks changed, or new risks emerged?
  - 4.4. **Increasing impact:** How might the projects increase their impact and what would be the associated human and financial capacity needs? How was the process of increasing impact understood at the design stage (e.g. project scaling, good practice guidelines through policy change, multi-stakeholder processes) and is there evidence that this has happened or is likely to happen?
5. **Sustainability:** A measure of whether the benefits of an intervention are likely to continue after external support has ended.
  - 5.1. **Evidence for sustainability:** Is there evidence that the key ingredients are being established or exist to the extent necessary to ensure the desired long-term positive impacts of the projects?
  - 5.2. **Risk and mitigation:** What external factors could have a high or medium likelihood of undoing or undermining the future sustainability of the projects' positive impacts? (e.g. political stability, economic crises and shocks, overall level of development, natural disasters, climate change). Are the projects adequately anticipating and taking measures to ensure resilience to these?
  - 5.3. **Exit/phase out plan:** Based upon existing plans and observations made during the evaluation, what are the key strategic options for the future of the projects (e.g. exit, scale down, replicate, scale-up, continue business-as-usual, major changes to approach)?
6. **Adaptive Capacity:** A measure of the extent to which the project applies strong adaptive management practice to ensure continued relevance, strong performance, and learning.
  - 6.1. **Applying good practice:** Did the teams examine good practice lessons from other conservation/ development experiences and consider these experiences in the project designs?

6.2. **Monitoring of status:** Did the projects establish a baseline status of targets and key contextual factors? Is there ongoing systematic monitoring of these?

6.3. **Monitoring of efficiency, effectiveness, impact:**

- Did the projects track intermediate results that are part of a theory of change that clearly lay out anticipated cause-effect relationships and enable definition of appropriate indicators?
- Is there ongoing, systematic, rigorous monitoring of output delivery, outcome attainment, and impact measurement, with plausible attribution to WWF's actions?
- Are adequate steps taken to ensure regular reflection on efficiency, effectiveness, and impact by the project teams and partners? Is monitoring information being used to support regular adaptation of the strategic approach?
- Are lessons documented and shared in a manner that is promoting learning by the project teams and the broader organisation?
- What percentage of overall staff time and funding is dedicated to project monitoring, adaptation, and learning? Are there any staff positions dedicated more than half-time or full time to support these efforts?

6.4. **Learning:** Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted regarding what worked and didn't work (e.g. case-studies, stories, good practices)?

6.5. **Risk assessment:** How often were the original risks and assumptions revisited during the intervention cycle? Were the risks assessed adequately enough and were external assumptions identified realistically? How were mitigation strategies identified and responded to by the intervention teams to optimise?

#### **Social and Economic Development criteria and guiding questions:**

7. **Gender:**

7.1. At the community level, have the projects had impacts on gender relations and/or the perceived roles or status of women?

- Have the workloads (both within and outside of the home) of women changed as a result of these projects? If so, how?
- Have there been any changes in women's participation in community planning or consultation meetings, both in terms of number of women participating and the level of participation?
- Have women been involved in financial inclusion projects taken on any other leadership roles within their communities?
- Are men or women experiencing tensions or challenges attributed to women's participation in financial inclusion and/or CBFM components?
- Are there any structural obstacles to women's participation that the projects have failed to account for?

7.2. At the government level, has there been an increase in capacity and willingness to consult with women as well as men, and to respond to women's needs and priorities?

7.3. At the government level, have the projects contributed to an increase in the number of women fisheries officers, or meaningful efforts to recruit/appoint/promote more female fisheries officers?

7.4. Overall, have practical and strategic gender interests been adequately considered in the projects' design and implementation? If so, how and to what effect? If not, why not? If not applicable, explain.

- Have the projects adequately accounted for risk of negative impacts associated with

challenging traditional gender roles? Have any such risks or negative impacts been reported?

- Have the projects been planned on the basis of a gender-differentiated beneficiaries' analysis?
- To what extent does a gender sensitive approach contribute to improved impact of the projects?
- What is the likeliness of increased gender equality beyond the projects' end?
- According to the OECD Gender Policy Marker, how would you classify these projects?
- What have been the lessons learnt, if any?

## **8. Economic Development**

- 8.1. Have the projects increased, diversified or otherwise changed household incomes?
- 8.2. Are households more, less or equally dependent on coastal fishing than they were when the projects started?
- 8.3. Are economic benefits distributed equitably among community members, or are there notable concentrations of benefits?

## **9. Participation**

- 9.1. Have provisions been made in the projects' designs and implementation to ensure that people with disabilities are able and encouraged to participate? What additional measures could be introduced to further enable people with disabilities to participate effectively?
- 9.2. Are there any other social groups for whom provisions have been made to facilitate participation?
- 9.3. Are there any groups that are excluded from participating in the projects? If so, why and have efforts been made to address their exclusion?
- 9.4. Have the projects included the implementation and promotion of safe and discrete complaints/feedback mechanisms that are accessible to all stakeholders?

**Annex 4** provides an example Evaluation Summary Table that could be used for scoring against the core, social and economic development evaluation criteria.

## **METHODOLOGY CONSIDERATIONS**

In summary, the evaluation will require a desk-top review of documents, phone/personal interviews of key personnel, and site visits to:

- Madang and Bogia/Sumkar districts, Madang Province, Papua New Guinea
- Ghizo islands area, central Western Province, Solomon Islands

WWF-Australia will work with the selected consultant to agree on the most appropriate methodologies to evaluate the projects. Once the evaluators are contracted, WWF will require an elaboration of the methodologies to be used.

The following outlines the broad expectations for the methodologies to be used:

- Desktop review of the projects' documentation (**Annex 5** provides a list of relevant documents).
- Interviews with key non-site based project personnel in WWF-Australia, WWF-Netherlands, and WWF-Pacific (Fiji office), including:
  - (a) In Australia:

- i) Dr Andrew Smith, Senior Manager, Marine Sustainable Development, WWF Australia ([asmith@wwf.org.au](mailto:asmith@wwf.org.au))
  - ii) Mr Nat Burke, Policy Manager, Asia-Pacific Sustainable Development, WWF Australia ([nburke@wwf.org.au](mailto:nburke@wwf.org.au))
  - iii) Ms Kathryn Michie, Public Sector Partnerships Manager, WWF Australia ([kmichie@wwf.org.au](mailto:kmichie@wwf.org.au))
  - iv) Mr Richard Leck, Head of Oceans, WWF Australia ([rleck@wwf.org.au](mailto:rleck@wwf.org.au))
- (b) In Netherlands:
  - i) Ms Carol Phua, Senior Marine Advisor, WWF-Netherlands ([cphua@wwf.nl](mailto:cphua@wwf.nl))
- (c) In Fiji:
  - i) Ms. Kesaia Tabunakawai, Representative [CEO], WWF-Pacific (Fiji office) ([ktabunakawai@wwfpacific.org](mailto:ktabunakawai@wwfpacific.org))
  - ii) Mr Francis Areki, Conservation Director, WWF-Pacific (Fiji office), ([fareki@wwfpacific.org](mailto:fareki@wwfpacific.org))
- Field visits to both countries, including interviews with key project stakeholders, including:
  - (a) In PNG:
    - i) Mr Kafuri Yaro, Programme Development Manager, WWF-PNG (Madang Office) ([kyaro@wwfpacific.org](mailto:kyaro@wwfpacific.org))
    - ii) Ms Rebecca Samuel, Marine Officer/Project Manager, WWF-PNG (Madang Office) ([rsamuel@wwfpacific.org](mailto:rsamuel@wwfpacific.org))
    - iii) Ms Belinda Chokoli, Financial Inclusion Officer, WWF-PNG (Madang Office) ([bchokoli@wwfpacific.org](mailto:bchokoli@wwfpacific.org))
    - iv) Multiple representatives of the Community Facilitators' network (arranged through the WWF-PNG Madang office staff).
    - v) Multiple representatives from each of the beneficiary communities (ideally nominated by the community themselves, or if not, please explain how representatives were selected). As far as possible, and where relevant, equal numbers of men and women should participate in the review, and where possible, brief discussions with community members NOT actively participating in the project should be included. At a minimum, this will entail a 2-day road trip to the north coast region of Madang province (logistics can be arranged by the WWF-PNG (Madang office)).
    - vi) A selection of in-country partners, including relevant government partners, as recommended by WWF-PNG. This should include Provincial Fisheries staff.
  - (b) In Solomon Islands:
    - i) Mr Shannon Seeto, Country Director WWF-Sol Is (Honiara Office) ([sseeto@wwfpacific.org](mailto:sseeto@wwfpacific.org))
    - ii) Ms Minnie Rafe, CBFM Programme Coordinator, WWF-Sol Is (Gizo Office) ([mrafe@wwfpacific.org](mailto:mrafe@wwfpacific.org))
    - iii) Ms Salome Topo, Gizo Field Project Coordinator, WWF-Sol Is (Gizo Office) ([stopo@wwfpacific.org](mailto:stopo@wwfpacific.org))

- iv) Ms Dafisha Aleziru, Community Outreach and Livelihoods Officer, WWF-Sol Is (Gizo Office) ([daleziru@wwfpacific.org](mailto:daleziru@wwfpacific.org))
  - v) Ms Zelda Hilly, Partnership Development Officer, WWF-Sol Is (Gizo Office) ([zhilly@wwfpacific.org](mailto:zhilly@wwfpacific.org))
  - vi) Richard Makini, CBFM Community Conservation Officer, WWF-Sol Is (Gizo Office) ([rmakini@wwfpacific.org](mailto:rmakini@wwfpacific.org))
  - vii) Multiple representatives from each of the beneficiary communities (ideally nominated by the community themselves, or if not, please explain how representatives were selected). As far as possible, and where relevant, equal numbers of men and women should participate in the review, and where possible, brief discussions with community members NOT actively participating in the project should be included. At a minimum, this will entail 1 or 2-day boat trip to islands adjacent to Ghizo (logistics can be arranged by the WWF-Sol Is (Gizo office).
  - viii) A selection of in-country partners, as recommended by WWF-Sol Is. This should include in-country partner representatives from, Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (Honiara), Western Province Fisheries Division (Gizo), Provincial Fisheries Advisory Committee (Gizo), as well as any other local partners as recommended by WWF-Sol Is.
- Appropriate interview information and data analysis and reporting.
  - Selection of project-related images/photos (with signed Talent Release Forms)
  - Short case studies or stories (~300-500 words with 1 or 2 related images) to illustrate key project outcomes.
  - The evaluation should be conducted in accordance with the Australian Council for International Development's *Guidelines for Ethical Research and Evaluation in Development* (2015), with particular consideration of culturally sensitive research design and ensuring the privacy and confidentiality, and obtaining the informed consent, of community members involved in the evaluation.
  - The evaluator or evaluation team will be required to complete WWF-Australia's *Child Protection Code of Conduct* prior to visiting the field and will be expected to comply with all of WWF-Australia's social policies<sup>11</sup>.

## PROFILE OF EVALUATOR(S) AND WWF SUPPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES

### Evaluator Criteria

At a minimum, the evaluator or evaluation team collectively should possess the following characteristics:

- Well qualified with demonstrated experience conducting evaluations in Melanesia similar to the one being commissioned. Must have strong and demonstrated experience considering: conservation and development components; marine fisheries; socioeconomic components, particularly related to gender; and realities involved in balancing strategic objectives with operational or financial constraints.
- Proven ability to both assess past effectiveness and provide strong strategic thinking on future direction.
- Relevant educational background, qualifications, and training in evaluation.

<sup>11</sup> See <http://www.wwf.org.au/about-us/policies>

- Technical knowledge of, and familiarity with, appropriate evaluation methodologies.
- Sensitivity to local beliefs, manners, and customs and ability to act with integrity and honesty in interactions with stakeholders.
- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English, plus at least one team member with PNG *Tok Pisin* and/or Solomon Islands *Tok Pijin* language skills.
- Demonstrated ability to generate high quality, rich, readable products on time and in line with expected deliverables.
- Orientation and approach is collegial and facilitates learning and analysis by project teams themselves.
- Cross cultural professional experience and strong active listening skills.

### WWF-Support

The following WWF staff will provide necessary information and support to the evaluator(s):

- Dr Andrew Smith, Senior Manager, Marine Sustainable Development ([asmith@wwf.org.au](mailto:asmith@wwf.org.au); +61(0)400201001)
  - Overall project information; technical advice on CBFM components; logistical advice
- Nat Burke, Policy Manager, Asia-Pacific Sustainable Development ([nburke@wwf.org.au](mailto:nburke@wwf.org.au); +61(0)402305737)
  - Overall project information; technical advice on social/development components
- Mr Shannon Seeto, Country Director WWF-Pacific Solomon Islands Office, Honiara, Solomon Islands ([sseeto@wwfpacific.org](mailto:sseeto@wwfpacific.org); +677 28023)
  - Facilitation of in-country information, support and logistics for Solomon Islands
- Ms Rebecca Samuel, Marine Officer WWF-Pacific (PNG) ([rsamuel@wwfpacific.org](mailto:rsamuel@wwfpacific.org); +67572636675)
  - Facilitation of in-country information, support and logistics for PNG

All the staff in the field offices will provide site logistics information and support.

## EVALUATION PROCESS, DELIVERABLES, AND TIMELINE

### Evaluation Process and Timeline Outline

Evaluation Task/Output	Dates or Deadline
Requests for Proposals circulated (based on the Evaluation Terms of Reference)	Thu 8 Feb 2018
Closing date for Evaluation RFP	Fri 16 Feb 2018
Evaluator(s) Contracted ASAP	~Fri 23 Feb 2018
Evaluation Plan submitted ASAP after signing	By Mon 5 Mar 2018
Evaluation team site visits to PNG and Sol Is completed	Thu 29 Mar 2018
Evaluation Interim Report due	Mon 9 April 2018
Feedback to Evaluators on Interim Report due	Mon 16 April 2018
Evaluation Final Report due	Thu 26 April 2018



## Deliverables

Deliverable	Deadline
Evaluation Plan <i>To be submitted to WWF as soon as feasible, but within 1 week of contract signing</i>	Within 1 week of contract signing
Evaluation Interim Report <i>Brief report on the conclusion of the site visits that summarises initial findings, key issues and recommendations (see <b>Annex 6</b> for suggested report format)</i>	Mon 9 April 2018
Evaluation Final Report <i>Full final evaluation report (see <b>Annex 6</b> for suggested report format)            Include short case studies / stories (~300-500 words with 1 or 2 illustrative images per story); and at least 10 images per country to illustrate the projects.</i>	Thu 26 April 2018

## BUDGET AND PAYMENT TERMS

A maximum of AUD \$35,000 is available for this evaluation, and is inclusive of all costs, including travel costs.

Proposed payment schedule:

Schedule of Payments to Contractor	Due Date	Payment %	Total (AUD)
Signing of contract		25%	8,750
Submission of Evaluation Plan		25%	8,750
Submission of Evaluation Interim Report		25%	8,750
Final payment on approval of Final Evaluation Report		25%	8,750
<b>Total Payment</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>35,000</b>

## ANNEX 1: WWF-AUSTRALIA DFAT ADPLAN FY2018 EXTRACTS FOR PAPUA NEW GUINEA PROJECT

*Note: The FY2016 and FY2017 DFAT ANCP ADPLANS and available Annual Performance Reports will also be provided to the consultants.*

### Community-Based Sustainable Development through Coastal Fisheries and Financial Inclusion (Papua New Guinea)

#### **WWF-Pacific (PNG) with support from WWF-Australia**

**Project Brief:** To improve the livelihoods and food security of coastal fishing communities in the central and north-coast regions of Madang Province, Papua New Guinea, through innovative and integrated approaches to sustainable fisheries, fisheries management, and women's economic empowerment and financial inclusion.

**Project Start Date:** 01/07/2012

**Project End Date:** 30/06/2018

#### **Provide details of project implementation prior to the current ADPlan period:**

This project commenced 01/07/2012 and has received ANCP funding in FY2012-13, FY2013-14, FY2014-15, FY2015-16, and FY2016-17.

**Primary DAC Code:** 31320 - Fishery development

**Secondary DAC Code:** 15170 - Women's equality organisations and institutions

**Tertiary DAC Code:** 31381 - Fishery education/training

**Sectoral Focus at Project Level:** Food Security

**Location:** Madang Province, Papua New Guinea  
(Madang Lagoon: Riwo; Krangret; Sek/Kananam; Siar; Bilia and Pana;  
Bogia District: Meiwok-Sikor-Ulingan Bay; Numuru-Malala-Rurunat; Sisimagun/Awar-Nubia and Korak; and  
Sumkar District: Bunabun/Tavulte.)

Latitude	Longitude	Location Name
5.1497° S	145.8158° E	Madang, Madang Province, PNG

#### **Implementing In-Country Partners:**

Implementing In-Country Partner/s	Partner Type	Partner Relationship
WWF-Pacific (Papua New Guinea Office)	International NGO/CSO	Contractual (financial)
National Fisheries Authority (NFA)	Government (Local/ Provincial/ National)	Non-contractual
Madang Provincial Government: Provincial Fisheries	Government (Local/ Provincial/ National)	Non-contractual
Communities with Community Based Organisations (CBOs): Digfun (Siar); Lingong Pain (Siar); Riwo (Riwo Village); Pana Bilia Ulipun Islands; Kranget (Kranget Island); Kananam (Kagul Village); Muguru (inland community linked to Sek/Kananam); and Yabob & Bilbil	Local NGO/CSO	Non-contractual
Communities without CBOs: Meiwok-Sikor-Ulingan Bay, Numuru-Malala-Rurunat, Sisimagun/Awar-Nubia; and Korak in Bogia District; and Bunabun / Tavulte in Sumkar District	Local NGO/CSO	Non-contractual

Entrepreneurial Development Training Centre (EDTC)	Education (School, University, Training) should not include Govt. Dept. of Education	Contractual (financial)
National Development Bank, Women in Business Program & Peoples MicroBank (Madang)	Private Sector	Non-contractual
World Vision PNG/International	International NGO/CSO	Contractual (financial)
Divine Word University (Business Studies Faculty)	Education (School, University, Training) should not include Govt. Dept. of Education	Contractual (financial)
Tupira Surf Club	Private Sector	Non-contractual

**Project Description:** Approximately 3.5 million people in PNG (half the known population) are dependent on fish as their main source of protein, comprising almost 75% of the diet of rural coastal communities. Income from fishing accounts for a large part of their livelihoods. Growing population pressure on the fish and their habitats is resulting in over-exploitation, food security and poverty issues.

The invisibility of women's contributions to fisheries has been identified in the Pacific as a key obstacle to development efforts and the equitable distribution of benefits from coastal fisheries. With increasing pressures on coastal fisheries, the knowledge, perspectives and buy-in of the women engaged in fishing are crucial to developing viable, long-term, sustainable management systems.

Using innovative and integrated approaches to sustainable fisheries, fisheries management, women's economic empowerment and financial inclusion, we are improving the livelihoods and food security of coastal communities in Madang, Bogia and Sumkar Districts of Madang Province, PNG. Community fishers and leaders are engaged through participating in the Spawning Potential Survey (SPS) approach (which assesses fish spawning potential to indicate stock status) and, where requested, support for inshore Fish Aggregating Devices (iFADs) as a sustainable alternative to reef fishing. The SPS and iFADs provide an opportunity to foster and strengthen Community-Based Fisheries co-Management (CBFM) to reduce fishing pressure on heavily exploited coastal systems, while still enabling fishers to meet their food and cash needs. To further support livelihoods in these communities, women are being empowered through the establishment and support of microfinance systems, catalysing small business initiatives, and the promotion of women's leadership in CBFM. Additionally, through skills training, community outreach, and technical and policy engagement with Provincial fisheries, the project will increase people's awareness of the importance of women's roles, experiences and perspectives in CBFM.

The project also employs male and female Community Facilitators from within communities to promote the crucial role that women already play and demonstrate how increasing their agency and leadership can improve the success and sustainability of coastal fisheries. At the formal level, the project will leverage partnerships with Provincial authorities to engage and train fisheries officers in gender-inclusive CBFM approaches, support agencies to integrate these principles into government policy, and promote an increase in the number of women fisheries officers.

Phase-2 (FY2016-FY2018) of this project will continue working with communities around Madang Lagoon (Riwo; Krangret; Sek/Kananam; Siar; Bilia and Pana), and the north-coast region of Madang Province (Meiwok-Sikor-Ulingan Bay, Numuru-Malala-Rurunat, Sisimagun/Awar-Nubia and Korak in Bogia District and Bunabun/Tavulte in Sumkar District).

**Objectives:** The project is implementing three integrated three-year objectives/outcomes:

**1. Sustainable coastal fisheries:** By 2018 the five target communities will have measurably improved their livelihoods and food security through innovative approaches to sustainable fisheries and CBFM; training and building local and Provincial/District Fisheries management capacity; community competence to use and manage iFADS; promoting the participation and leadership of women in CBFM; and facilitating peer-to-peer fishers' and Community Facilitators' networks.

**2. Financial Inclusion:** By 2018 livelihood opportunities have ensured the benefits from transitioning to more sustainable fisheries have contributed to improved women's empowerment, food security and poverty alleviation through consolidation of the Savings Groups/CBOs approach (improved financial literacy, governance, leadership, documentation); training of local trainers; application and embedding of sustainability criteria (environmental; social/ethical; financial); and small business planning and management.

**3. Community-focused monitoring:** By 2018 communities are making informed CBFM adaptive management decisions based on key data from appropriate community-focused fisheries and socioeconomic monitoring being undertaken and communicated by trained local Community Facilitators, demonstrating the positive results of their shift to more sustainable and effectively managed fisheries and improved women's financial inclusion.

***Project Outcomes and Outputs:***

This project focuses on:

- Building local staff/partner capacity—including Provincial/District Fisheries, local CBOs and CFs;
- Improving integration—of the components and with related projects;
- Providing greater emphasis on community-centred monitoring;
- Promoting the participation and leadership of women in CBFM;
- Household income diversification through women's financial inclusion
- Building peer-to-peer network support;
- Leveraging lessons-learnt to new communities and to inform the national CBFM agenda.

**Sustainable coastal fisheries:**

1. By 2018, at least five communities are sustainably fishing and effectively managing their fisheries within a CBFM framework, contributing to improved livelihoods and food security.

***Indicators:***

- 1.a Five communities have adopted and implementing CBFM plans.
- 1.b The Spawning Potential Ratios of at least 5 target fish species have improved by at least 5%.
- 1.c At least one women in each community is actively engaged in the community's fisheries management committee/leadership group.

***Outputs FY2018:***

- 1.1 Five communities have developed, adopted and implemented CBFM plans.  
*[4 engaged in CBFM in FY2017]*
- 1.2 Five communities' CBFM leadership/management groups include at least one woman member.
- 1.3 Peer-to-peer fishers' and Community Facilitators' networks/associations formally operating.  
*[Informal peer-to-peer Community Facilitators' network formed in FY2017]*
- 1.4 At least two Provincial/District Fisheries officers applying CBFM and the SPS approach.  
*[Letter of Support signed between Madang Provincial Fisheries and WWF-PNG in FY2017]*
- 1.5 Five communities using SPS approach to inform CBFM adaptive management.  
*[4 initiated SPS in FY2017]*

**Financial Inclusion:**

2. By 2018, at least 15 Savings Groups/CBOs are financially strong, well governed, have contributed to the establishment of small-business initiatives, and improved women's empowerment and livelihoods.

**Indicators:**

- 2.a Membership of the original 12 CBOs is stable and accessing Peoples MicroBank loans.
- 2.b At least three new Savings Groups established in north-coast communities.
- 2.c Sustainability criteria are being applied to microloans;
- 2.d 'Sustainability case statement' presented to PNG NDB/Peoples MicroBank to influence national microloan criteria.
- 2.e Small business initiatives started increases by at least 10% on FY2017.

**Outputs FY2018:**

- 2.1 Existing 15 Madang lagoon savings CBOs are stable and operating independently of WWF.  
*[260 women from 11 communities have been trained from FY2013 to FY2017. 12 CBOs operating independently in FY2017]*
- 2.2 Madang north-coast Savings Groups are applying 'sustainability criteria' to their microfinance and small business activities.  
*['Sustainability' included in north-coast financial inclusion workshops in FY2017]*
- 2.3 At least three village training agents providing savings-and-loans, microfinance planning and training to at least two Madang north-coast communities, resulting in at least one new Savings Group.
- 2.4 Microfinance support and training documentation/guides distributed to all target communities.
- 2.5 Business Case for microloan 'sustainability criteria' presented to NDB/Peoples MicroBank.  
*[Initial discussions with NDB/People's MicroBank about applying sustainability criteria to microloans completed in FY2017]*

**Community-focused monitoring:**

3. By 2018, local partners are implementing community-focused fisheries and socioeconomic monitoring and providing targeted awareness and communication of results that enable communities to understand the positive economic/environmental impacts of more sustainable fisheries and women's financial inclusion.

**Indicators:**

- 3.a Each target community has at least two active Community Facilitators (one male; one female).
- 3.b Each target community is using SPS to monitor the status of at least their top 5 fish species.

**Outputs FY2018:**

- 3.1 At least 10 CFs (male and female) in five Madang north-coast communities are trained and undertaking fisheries and socioeconomic monitoring, targeted awareness and communicating the results.  
*[5 CFs received basic monitoring training in FY2017]*
- 3.2 Community Facilitators in Madang lagoon communities complete two 6-monthly fisheries and socioeconomic surveys and report back to their communities.  
*[6-monthly surveys completed in FY2016 and EY2017]*
- 3.3 CFs in at least five communities using SPS to monitor the status of at least their top 5 fish species.

**Sustainability:** Project sustainability depends on the communities and partners recognising and acknowledging that an integrated approach to the sustainable fisheries, fisheries management, women's economic empowerment and financial inclusion initiatives, are improving their livelihood

and food security benefits. A significant portion of the project is focused on building capacity within communities (fishers; women; Community Facilitators), local CBOs/women's groups, and Provincial/District Fisheries, so that by the end of Phase 2 they can manage and maintain their fisheries sustainably, and the benefits of the transition more sustainable fisheries will contribute through the microfinance Savings Groups/CBOs to improved livelihoods, food security and poverty alleviation.

With increasing pressures on coastal fisheries, the knowledge, perspectives and buy-in of the women engaged in fishing are crucial to developing viable, long-term, sustainable management systems.

Three fundamental cross-cutting strategies underpin WWF-PNG's work program:

- Innovation—developing and testing new and innovative approaches (e.g. SPS; coastal iFADs);
- Partnerships and Capacity Building—strengthening and transferring skills, knowledge and leadership to local partners (CFs; CBOs; fishers; women; Provincial/District Fisheries);
- Communications and Awareness—leveraging the power of positive communication and empowerment, especially through the local partners.

**Private sector engagement:** John West has been engaged as a private sector partner to the project through four years of financial support. Their contributions have been crucial to the project, and especially to the women's financial inclusion (microfinance) component, including the establishment of the microfinance CBOs/Savings Groups, and new small businesses by community-based women and men. John West has continued their support for FY2018.

The microfinance component to date has allowed 15 microfinance CBOs (more than 260 women; 11 communities) to be established in the Madang lagoon area and they are successfully accessing NDB/Peoples MicroBank loans. We have identified basic financial literacy and understanding of small business planning and management as critical blocks to success by the women. In Phase 2 we are focusing on expanding financial literacy, the small business training, and providing guidance through small business plan templates and advice, so that the CBOs/savings groups can maximise the benefits of the NDB/Peoples MicroBank small loan opportunities. We are working with women who have started small businesses in Phase 1—learning from their experiences and lessons to benefit others. The microfinance component is crucial to ensuring diversity and improvements in livelihood opportunities. A key result is for some of the women to graduate to be 'classified' as "women in business" by the NDB, and be able to successfully run small businesses on their own.

**Other Information:**

This project is incorporated within the WWF-Pacific (Papua New Guinea) "Sustainable and Resilient Coastal Communities Programme" which utilises three integrated strategies: (1) Sustainable Fisheries – through effective community-based fisheries management, partnerships and innovative management approaches; (2) Sustainable Community Livelihoods – by enhancing community livelihood opportunities through financial inclusion and local women's empowerment; and (3) Resilient Coasts – through fostering the adaptation and resilience of coastal communities to climate-change.

The Madang north coast component of this project is being implemented in conjunction with the "Enhancing the Adaptive Capacity of Coastal Communities and Islands Region to Climate Change-related Floods in Madang Province, PNG" project funded by UNDP/CCDA Climate Change Adaptation Fund. This is a two-phase project (FY2014-2018). Phase 1 of this project was completed in 2016 and Phase 2 will be completed in 2018. It focuses on supporting 16 pilot communities to raise 40,000 mangrove seedlings to plant 40 ha (30 km) and to further protect an estimated 4,660 ha (75 km) of degraded coastline along the Madang north coast. It also provides climate change education and awareness concerning climate change issues and risks, to enable mangrove planting as an adaptation strategy to coastal erosion and sea level rise.

## ANNEX 2: WWF-AUSTRALIA DFAT ADPLAN FY2018 EXTRACTS FOR SOLOMON ISLANDS PROJECT

*Note: The FY2016 and FY2017 DFAT ANCP ADPLANS and available Annual Performance Reports will also be provided to the consultants.*

### Community-Based Sustainable Development through Coastal Fisheries and Financial Inclusion (Solomon Islands)

#### *WWF-Pacific (Solomon Islands) with support from WWF-Australia*

**Project Brief:** To improve the livelihoods and food security of coastal fishing communities in the Ghizo islands area, central Western Province, Solomon Islands, through innovative and integrated approaches to sustainable fisheries, fisheries management, and women's economic empowerment and financial inclusion.

**Project Start Date:** 01/07/2012

**Project End Date:** 30/06/2018

#### **Provide details of project implementation prior to the current ADPlan period:**

This project commenced 01/07/2012 and has received ANCP funding in FY2012-13, FY2013-14, FY2014-15, FY2015-16, and FY2016-17.

**Primary DAC Code:** 31320 - Fishery development

**Secondary DAC Code:** 15170 - Women's equality organisations and institutions

**Tertiary DAC Code:** 31381 - Fishery education/training

**Sectoral Focus at Project Level:** Food Security

**Location:** Western Province, Solomon Islands  
(Ghizo, Kolombangara, Vella Lavella, Ranongga, Simbo islands)

Latitude	Longitude	Location Name
8.0806° S	156.7963° E	Gizo, Western Province, Solomon Islands

#### **Implementing In-Country Partners:**

Implementing In-Country Partner/s	Partner Type	Partner Relationship
WWF-Pacific (Solomon Islands Office)	International NGO/CSO	Contractual (financial)
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR)	Government (Local/ Provincial/ National)	Non-contractual
Western Province Provincial Government: Provincial Fisheries Division	Government (Local/ Provincial/ National)	Non-contractual
Ghizo Environment Livelihood Conservation Association (GELCA)	Local NGO/CSO	Non-contractual
Nusatuva Environment, Conservation and Development Association (NECDA)	Local NGO/CSO	Non-contractual
WorldFish Centre (Solomon Islands)	International NGO/CSO	Contractual (financial)
Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM)	Government (Local/ Provincial/ National)	Non-contractual
Kolombangara Island Biodiversity Conservation Association (KIBCA)	Local NGO/CSO	Non-contractual
Ghizo-Raru Local Fishers' for Sustainable Fisheries Association	Local NGO/CSO	Non-contractual
Simbo Island Megapode Women's Savings Club	Local NGO/CSO	Non-contractual

Ecological Solutions Solomon Islands (ESSI)	Local NGO/CSO	Contractual (financial)
Kalikongu Women's Saving Club	Local NGO/CSO	Non-contractual

**Project Description:** Most of the Solomon Islands population are largely dependent on fish as their main source of protein, comprising almost 75% of the rural diet of coastal communities. Fishing accounts for a large part of their livelihoods. It's predicted that by 2030 fisheries production will be unable to meet expected demand. Growing population pressure on marine resources and their habitats is resulting in over-exploitation, food security and poverty issues.

The invisibility of women's contributions to fisheries has been identified in the Pacific as a key obstacle to development efforts and the equitable distribution of benefits from coastal fisheries. With increasing pressures on coastal fisheries, the knowledge, perspectives and buy-in of the women engaged in fishing are crucial to developing viable, long-term, sustainable management systems.

Using innovative and integrated approaches to sustainable fisheries, fisheries management, women's economic empowerment and financial inclusion, we are improving the livelihoods and food security of coastal communities in the broader Ghizo islands area, central Western Province, Solomon Islands. Community fishers and leaders are engaged through participating in the Spawning Potential Survey (SPS) approach (which assesses fish spawning potential to indicate stock status) and, where requested, support for inshore Fish Aggregating Devices (iFADs) as a sustainable alternative to reef fishing. The SPS and iFADs provide an opportunity to foster and strengthen Community-Based Fisheries co-Management (CBFM) to reduce fishing pressure on heavily exploited coastal systems, while still enabling fishers to meet their food and cash needs. To further support livelihoods in these communities, women are being empowered through the establishment and support of microfinance Savings Clubs, catalysing small business initiatives, and the promotion of women's leadership in CBFM. Additionally, through skills training, community outreach, and technical and policy engagement with Provincial fisheries, the project will increase people's awareness of the importance of women's roles, experiences and perspectives in CBFM.

The project also employs male and female Community Facilitators from within communities to promote the crucial role that women already play and demonstrate how increasing their agency and leadership can improve the success and sustainability of coastal fisheries. At the formal level, the project will leverage partnerships with Provincial authorities to engage and train fisheries officers in gender-inclusive CBFM approaches, support agencies to integrate these principles into government policy, and promote an increase in the number of women fisheries officers.

Phase-2 (FY2016-FY2018) of this project will continue working with communities on Ghizo and Kolombangara islands (Saeraghi, Nusatuva, Babanga, Hunda and Petunia), while extending activities to the nearby islands of Vella Lavella, Ranongga and Simbo.

**Objectives:** The project is implementing three integrated three-year objectives/outcomes:

**1. Sustainable coastal fisheries:** By 2018 the five target communities will have measurably improved their livelihoods and food security through innovative approaches to sustainable fisheries and CBFM; training and building local and Provincial Fisheries management capacity; community competence to deploy, use and manage iFADs; promoting the participation and leadership of women in CBFM; and facilitating peer-to-peer fishers' networks/association.

**2. Financial inclusion:** By 2018 livelihood opportunities have ensured the benefits from transitioning to more sustainable fisheries have contributed to improved women's empowerment, food security and poverty alleviation through consolidation of the Savings Clubs approach (improved financial literacy, governance, leadership, documentation); training of local women trainers; embedding of sustainability criteria (environmental; social/ethical; financial); small business planning and management; and promotion of national 'microfinance protocols'.



**3. Community-focused monitoring:** By 2018 communities are making informed CBFM adaptive management decisions based on key data from appropriate community-focused fisheries and socioeconomic monitoring being undertaken and communicated by trained local Community Facilitators, demonstrating the positive results of their shift to more sustainable and effectively managed fisheries and improved women's financial inclusion.

***Project Outcomes and Outputs:***

This project focused on:

- Building local staff and partner capacity—including Provincial Fisheries Division, local CBOs and CFs;
- Improving integration—of the components and with related projects;
- Providing greater emphasis on community-centred monitoring;
- Promoting the participation and leadership of women in CBFM;
- Household income diversification through women's financial inclusion;
- Building peer-to-peer network support;
- Leveraging lessons learnt to new communities and to inform the national CBFM agenda.

**Sustainable coastal fisheries:**

1. By 2018, at least five communities are sustainably fishing and effectively managing their fisheries within a Community-Based Fisheries co-Management framework, contributing to improved livelihoods and food security.

***Targets/Indicators:***

- 1.a Five communities have adopted and are implementing CBFM plans.
- 1.b Two CBFM plans have been formally endorsed under the Fisheries Act (2015).
- 1.c The Spawning Potential Ratios of at least 5 target fish species have improved by at least 5%.
- 1.d At least one women in each target community is actively engaged in the community's fisheries management committee/leadership group.

***Outputs FY2018:***

- 1.1 Five communities have developed, adopted and implemented CBFM plans.  
*[FY2017: 4 communities engaged in CBFM]*
- 1.2 Two CBFM plans formally endorsed under the Fisheries Act.
- 1.3 Five CBFM leadership/management groups include at least one woman member.
- 1.4 Facilitated the further development and operation of a peer-to-peer fishers' network/association.  
*[FY2017: "Ghizo-Raru Local Fishers' Association" established]*
- 1.5 At least two Provincial Fisheries Division Officers engaging and committed to CBFM and the SPS approach resulting from formal partnership.  
*[FY2017: MOU signed between Western Province Government and WWF-Solomon Islands]*
- 1.6 Five communities using the SPS approach in support of CBFM.  
*[FY2017: 2 communities using SPS]*

**Financial inclusion:**

2. By 2018, at least seven Savings Clubs are financially strong, well governed, have contributed to the establishment of small business initiatives, and improved women's empowerment and livelihoods.

***Targets/Indicators:***

- 2.a Membership of the original seven Savings Clubs is stable or increasing.
- 2.b Number of loans made and repaid are stable or increasing.
- 2.c Number of small business initiatives started increases by at least 5% annually.

**Outputs FY2018:**

- 2.1 Existing seven Savings Clubs stable or increasing through at least four training workshops (financial literacy; governance and leadership; and/or business planning), and at least six Balance-and-Audits completed.  
*[940 women from 33 communities have been trained from FY2013 to FY2017. Bimonthly Balance and Audits completed with each Savings Club in FY2016 and FY2017]*
- 2.2 All ten Savings Clubs are applying 'sustainability criteria' to their loans approvals; and small business entrepreneurs trained in sustainability.  
*[FY2017: Sustainability criteria developed in FY2016; applied to all savings club loans]*
- 2.3 At least five local women trainers trained to provide financial literacy, microfinance and small business planning and training to at least two new communities in the Ghizo islands region, directly resulting in at least one new Savings Club.  
*[FY2017: 4 women trained and conducted financial literacy workshops]*
- 2.4 Microfinance support and training documentation and guides completed and distributed to target communities and Savings Clubs.

**Community-focused monitoring:**

3. By 2018, local partners are implementing community-focused fisheries and socioeconomic monitoring and providing targeted awareness and communication of results that enable communities to understand the positive economic/environmental impacts of more sustainable fisheries and women's financial inclusion.

**Targets/Indicators:**

- 3.a Each target community has at least two active Community Facilitators (one male; one female).
- 3.b Each target community is using SPS to monitor the status of at least their top 5 fish species.

**Outputs FY2018:**

- 3.1 Community Facilitators in five communities are trained and undertaking fisheries and socioeconomic monitoring, targeted awareness and communicating the results.
- 3.2 Five communities using SPS other monitoring results to inform CBFM adaptive management.

**Sustainability:** Project sustainability depends on the communities and partners recognising and acknowledging that an integrated approach to the sustainable fisheries, fisheries management, women's economic empowerment and financial inclusion initiatives, are improving their livelihood and food security benefits. A significant portion of the project is focused on building capacity within communities (fishers; women; Community Facilitators), local CBOs/women's groups, and Provincial Fisheries, so that by the end of Phase 2 they can manage and maintain their fisheries sustainably, and the benefits of the transition to more sustainable fisheries will contribute through the microfinance Savings Clubs to improved livelihoods, food security and poverty alleviation.

With increasing pressures on coastal fisheries, the knowledge, perspectives and buy-in of the women engaged in fishing are crucial to developing viable, long-term, sustainable management systems.

Three fundamental cross-cutting strategies underpin WWF-Solomon Islands' work program:

- Innovation—developing and testing new and innovative approaches (e.g. SPS; coastal iFADs);
- Partnerships and Capacity Building—strengthening and transferring skills, knowledge and leadership to local partners (CFs; CBOs; fishers; women; Provincial Fisheries);
- Communications and Awareness—leveraging the power of positive communication and empowerment, especially through the local partners.

**Private sector engagement:** John West has been engaged as a private sector partner to the project through four years of financial support. Their contributions have been crucial to the project, and especially to the women’s financial inclusion (microfinance) component, including the establishment of the microfinance Savings Clubs, the microloans revolving funds, and new small businesses by community-based women. John West has continued their support for FY2018.

John West and DFAT’s support of the microfinance component to date has allowed 10 Savings Clubs to be established, engaging over 940 women from 33 communities, with over AUD\$51,500 in savings, and 150 loans made to its members. The loans have been used to start 120 small businesses initiatives, including bakeries, small goods store, crafts, poultry and piggeries. Basic small business training has also been provided. The microfinance component is crucial to ensuring diversity and improvements in livelihood opportunities.

**Other Information:** This project is incorporated within the WWF-Pacific (Solomon Islands) “Sustainable Coastal Communities Programme” which utilises three integrated strategies:

(1) Sustainable Fisheries—through effective community-based co-management, partnerships and innovative management approaches; (2) Sustainable Community Livelihoods—by enhancing community livelihood opportunities through financial inclusion and women’s empowerment; and (3) Ridge-to-Reef Community Planning—through a participatory resource mapping and planning framework.

This project is being implemented in conjunction with the three-year (FY2016 to FY2018) “WWF-Solomon Islands Strengthening Community Rights-Based Fisheries Management Programme” funded by WWF-Netherlands. This Programme focuses on working with communities and the local government to develop and apply rights-based fisheries co-management approaches as the foundation for establishing effective and enduring community-based co-management of coastal fisheries—complementing and supporting the objectives of this ADPlan. This Programme has enabled WWF-Pacific (SI) to hire some additional specialist staff who are able to collaborate with and support this project.

Our work to promote sustainable fisheries co-management and improve sustainable livelihood opportunities is incorporated into an overarching Ridge-to-Reef (R2R) planning framework, which was funded by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) in 2016 and 2017. Participatory mapping of important natural resources across marine and terrestrial ecosystems is used to prioritise areas for conservation and development planning, and improve the overall sustainability of coastal communities. WWF partners with local Community-Based Organisations and engages with community leaders on Ghizo and Kolombangara Island in the resource planning process. WWF contributes to the conservation of biodiversity, securing livelihoods, maintaining important ecosystem services, and building ecosystem resilience against the impacts of climate change. Our work also plays an important role in building local ownership and social accountability as well as promoting community understanding of the interconnectedness of marine and terrestrial ecosystems and resources.

## ANNEX 3: WWF-NETHERLANDS PROJECT SUMMARY

*Note: The original and the revised proposal and 3-year work plan will be provided separately to the consultants*

**Project Proposal Title: “WWF-Solomon Islands Small-Scale Fisheries Rights-Based Management Programme”**

**Operational Title: “Strengthening Community Rights-Based Fisheries Management Programme”**

### Revised Goal and Objectives

**Long Term Goal:** By 2030, the Western Province of Solomon Islands is implementing rights-based approaches to fisheries co-management resulting in the sustainable, fair and legal use of natural resources and improvement in food security and livelihoods.

**Six Year Goal:** By 2021, the identified rights-based management approaches are being applied, monitored and adaptively co-managed by at least four central Western Province communities in collaboration with government, and are showing demonstrable social, ecological and economic results.

**Three Year Goal:** By 2018, at least two central Western Province communities have agreed and initiated co-management of fisheries using rights-based management approaches that are supported by a strengthened Western Province Provincial Fisheries Division, resulting in improved status of coastal food fish resources

**Objective 1 - Strengthening community rights-based fisheries co-management:** By 2018, at least two communities in the central Western Province are applying fair and equitable fisheries co-management based on rights-based management approaches resulting in a reduction in unsustainable fisheries practices.

**Objective 2 - Strengthening Government capacity for rights-based fisheries co-management:** By 2018, rights-based fisheries co-management approaches have been adopted by the Western Province Provincial Government Fisheries Division and capacity increased for application throughout the central Western Province; and the National Coordinating Committee have endorsed the community rights-based fisheries management approaches Resources Kit as a core component of the national CBRM+/EAFM framework.

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Introduction

The Solomon Islands is one of the six countries in the Coral Triangle, which hosts the planet’s richest centre of marine life and coral diversity, with over 6,000 species of fish and 75% of the world’s coral species. Most of the population of the Solomon Islands lives within 25 km of the coast. Fish is the main source of protein for coastal communities, accounting for 75% of the rural diet, and income from fishing accounts for a large part of their livelihoods.

Customary land ownership is the norm in Solomon Islands. In the Western Province, 80% of the total land is held by customary land owners and the remaining 20% is alienated land held by the national government or by non-Solomon Islanders as perpetual estate. Customary law and tenure of land and coastal areas - including coral reefs and mangrove forests – are recognised in the constitution.

### Rationale for a RBM approach

The Reefs at Risk report shows that human pressures on the Solomon Island reefs increased by up to 60% between 1998 and 2007. This was mainly due to overfishing and destructive fishing as a result of

population growth in coastal communities, which in turn raises concerns about food security and poverty. It is predicted that by 2030 fisheries production will not be able to supply the demand.

Contrary to the norm, on Ghizo Island approximately 80% of land is alienated land held by the national government, which makes it easy for people who are not local to the island to obtain registered land titles. Communities living in and around Ghizo Island include migrant communities from Malaita and nearby islands, such as Vella Lavella, Ranongga and Simbo; Gilbertese communities (relocated from Kiribati to Ghizo during the British occupation); and expatriate communities including hotel, resort, dive operators and foreign business owners. This complex backdrop has created tensions and disputes amongst (and even within) groups. While the Western Province islands of Kolombangara, Vella Lavella, Ranongga and Simbo do not have the complexities faced by Ghizo communities, they are still seeking support to address their concerns about declining fish catches.

The government fisheries agencies (provincial and national) are unable to provide financial and/or technical support to these islands due to limited capacity, resources and effective appropriate management approaches. The range of threat drivers—population pressures, protein and cash needs—combined with the range and levels of complexities of land and marine resource rights, governance and tenure systems, provide a prime location to test, apply and promote the wider adoption of RBM as an approach to improve coastal fisheries co-management within an ecosystem framework.

### **Opportunities**

WWF SI has been working closely with communities and the provincial government in the Western Province and the national government in Honiara over the past ten years and has a memorandum of understanding with the Solomon Island National Government. WWF SI also is a member of the Solomon Islands National Coordinating Committee which meets every month to review and assess proposals and projects in support of the Solomon Island National Plan of Action.

Over the past year WWF SI has been working with community fishers to trial a new approach for assessing the status of key food fish species. The LB-SPR approach determines spawning potential of target fish species, and hence their population health. The results indicate which species are being over-fished and declining, helping to engage fishers in community level fisheries management decision-making. Enabling fishers to evaluate their own coastal fish stocks will help maximise compliance and minimise enforcement; the only way to ensure effective management in the more remote communities.

### **The SI RBM programme**

The SI RBM programme will be implemented with up to four communities from Ghizo, Kolombangara, Ranongga and Vella Lavella in the north-western part of the Western Province. The primary conservation targets are coastal food resources (coastal food fish species, reef and nearshore pelagic sharks, humphead wrasse, marine turtles, sea-grapes, seaweed) and coastal/marine ecosystems (coral reefs, mangroves, seagrass beds and beaches). The human well-being targets include food security, livelihoods, women's empowerment and cultural and belief systems.

*[Revised goals and objectives]*

**Long Term Goal:** By 2030, the Western Province of Solomon Islands is implementing rights-based approaches to fisheries co-management resulting in the sustainable, fair and legal use of natural resources and improvement in food security and livelihoods.

**Six Year Goal:** By 2021, the identified rights-based management approaches are being applied, monitored and adaptively co-managed by at least four central Western Province communities in collaboration with government, and are showing demonstrable social, ecological and economic results.

**Three Year Goal:** By 2018, at least two central Western Province communities have agreed and initiated co-management of fisheries using rights-based management approaches that are supported by a strengthened Western Province Provincial Fisheries Division, resulting in improved status of coastal food fish resources

The programme will take a stakeholder-oriented approach, with its three objectives focused around implementation of communities, wider stakeholders and government.

**Objective 1 - Strengthening community rights-based fisheries co-management:** By 2018, at least two communities in the central Western Province are applying fair and equitable fisheries co-management based on rights-based management approaches resulting in a reduction in unsustainable fisheries practices.

**Objective 2 - Strengthening Government capacity for rights-based fisheries co-management:** By 2018, rights-based fisheries co-management approaches have been adopted by the Western Province Provincial Government Fisheries Division and capacity increased for application throughout the central Western Province; and the National Coordinating Committee have endorsed the community rights-based fisheries management approaches Resources Kit as a core component of the national CBRM+/EAFM framework.

#### **Risks to success**

The primary external risks include:

- Provincial Fisheries capacity does not change through national government support (lack of funding flow, funding flowing but to wrong place, funding flows but still no changes).
- Provincial Fisheries capacity and skills inappropriate (staff hired for wrong reasons, skills needed absent, recruitment pool limited)
- Community expectations raised too high leading to disputes and misunderstandings
- Natural events disrupt the programme (tsunami, flooding, earthquakes, cyclones)

Internally, there are risks related to staff numbers and capacity, as well as the turnover of staff and the office facilities. The ability to contract staff for a three year period will help, however WWF SI needs to identify additional funding so that support staff can be fully funded. It will be important for staff to keep records of external meetings and stakeholder relationships to enable continuity if staff leave.

#### **Human and material resources for the RBM programme**

This programme will require up to four additional fulltime WWF staff and related office resources: Fisheries RBM Programme Manager - Ghizo; Community Facilitator - Ghizo; Partnerships Development Officer - Ghizo; and a Communications Officer - Honiara. In addition, there will be a need for two half-FTEs: the Programme Management Assistant; and the Finance and Administration Assistant. The programme will maximise operating with and through the key partners, including government agencies, NGOs and community organisations. Given the need for access to remote communities on Ghizo Islands as well as the adjacent target islands, vehicle and boat transport costs will be significant, requiring purchase of a new boat and boat safety materials.

## ANNEX 4: EXAMPLE EVALUATION SUMMARY TABLE – SCORING AGAINST THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluators are to assign the project a Rating and Score for each criterion as follows:

- **Very Good/4:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *very good* extent.
- **Good/3:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *good* extent.
- **Fair/2:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *fair* extent.
- **Poor/1:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *poor* extent.
- **N/A:** The criterion was *not assessed* (in the ‘Justification,’ explain why).
- **D/I:** The criterion was considered but *data were insufficient* to assign a rating or score (in the ‘Justification,’ elaborate).

Evaluators are also to provide a brief justification for the rating and score assigned. Identify most notable strengths to build upon as well as highest priority issues or obstacles to overcome. Note that this table should not be a comprehensive summary of findings and recommendations, but an overview only. A more comprehensive presentation should be captured in the evaluation report and the management response document. Even if the report itself contains sensitive information, the table should be completed in a manner that can be readily shared with any internal WWF audience.

Criteria	Description of Strong Performance [adapt as necessary]	Evaluator Rating/ Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
Relevance	The project/programme addresses the necessary factors in the specific programme context to bring about positive changes in conservation targets – biodiversity and/or footprint issues (i.e. species, ecosystems, ecological processes, including associated ecosystem services supporting human wellbeing).		
Quality of Design	1. The project/programme has rigorously applied key design tools (e.g. the WWF PPMS). 2. The project/programme is hitting the right ‘pressure points’ to meet necessary and sufficient conditions for success		
Efficiency	1. Most/all programme activities have been delivered with efficient use of human & financial resources and with strong value for money. 2. Governance and management systems are appropriate, sufficient, and operate efficiently.		
Effectiveness	1. Most/all intended outcomes—stated objectives/intermediate results regarding key threats and other factors affecting project/programme targets—were attained. 2. There is strong evidence indicating that changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the WWF project or programme		
Impact	1. Most/all goals—stated desired changes in the status of species, ecosystems, and ecological processes—were realised. 2. Evidence indicates that perceived changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the WWF project or programme.		
Sustainability	1. Most or all factors for ensuring sustainability of results/impacts are being or have been established. 2. Scaling up mechanisms have been put in place with risks and assumptions re-assessed and addressed.		
Adaptive Management	1. Project/programme results (outputs, outcomes, impacts) are qualitatively and quantitatively demonstrated through regular collection and analysis of monitoring data. 2. The project/programme team uses these findings, as well as those from related projects/ efforts, to strengthen its work and performance 3. Learning is documented and shared for project/programme and organisational learning		
Gender	1. At the community level, have the projects had impacts on gender relations and/or the perceived roles or status of women? 2. At the government level, has there been an increase in capacity and willingness to consult with women as well as men, and to respond to women’s needs and priorities?		

Criteria	Description of Strong Performance [adapt as necessary]	Evaluator Rating/ Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
	3. At the government level, have the projects contributed to an increase in the number of women fisheries officers, or meaningful efforts to recruit/appoint/promote more female fisheries officers? 4. Overall, have practical and strategic gender interests been adequately considered in the projects' design and implementation? If so, how and to what effect?		
<b>Economic Development</b>	1. Have the projects increased, diversified or otherwise changed household incomes? 2. Are households more, less or equally dependent on coastal fishing than they were when the projects started? 3. Are economic benefits distributed equitably among community members, or are there notable concentrations of benefits?		
<b>Participation</b>	1. Have provisions been made in the projects' designs and implementation to ensure that people with disabilities are able and encouraged to participate? 2. Are there any other social groups for whom provisions have been made to facilitate participation? 3. Are there any groups that are excluded from participating in the projects? If so, why and have efforts been made to address their exclusion? 4. Have the projects included the implementation and promotion of safe and discrete complaints/feedback mechanisms that are accessible to all stakeholders?		



## **ANNEX 5: KEY PROJECT DOCUMENTS**

The following is a list of documents that will be provided to the evaluator(s):

DFAT ANCP ADPlans – submitted for FY2016, FY2017, FY2018 for PNG and Sol Is projects

DFAT ANCP ADPlan Performance Reports – submitted for FY2016 for PNG and Sol Is projects  
(nb: FY2017 report not due until Sept 2018) – Reports include case studies

John West proposal FY2017-FY2018 “Improving Livelihoods of Coastal Communities in Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands through Sustainable Fisheries and Financial Inclusion: John West Community Fisheries Fund”

WWF-NL’s project proposal “Strengthening Community Rights-Based Fisheries Management Programme” FY2016 to FY2018

Technical Progress Reports from WWF-Sol Is and WWF-PNG – Brief 6-monthly reports

Case Studies and posters from WWF-Sol Is and WWF-PNG (2017)

Other technical reports from each project:

- Preliminary Situation and Stakeholder Analysis for Community-Based Fisheries Co-Management. A Review conducted for WWF-Pacific (Sol Is). (2016)
- Interpreting ‘Rights-Based Fisheries Management’ for Solomon Islands. (2016)
- Socioeconomic iFAD Baseline Report (rev 2016)
- How to make a rafter: A Guide for communities in the Solomon Islands. (2016)
- Spawning Potential Survey consultancy reports.

Media reports on the projects (newspaper articles; web links; video links)

Previous evaluation report

ANCP NGO Field Visit Monitoring & Evaluation Report – Solomon Islands – 25 March 2017

Improving livelihoods of coastal artisanal fishing communities in PNG and Solomon Islands through piloting alternative fishing methods – Project Evaluation – Final Report (June 2015)

## **ANNEX 6: EVALUATION REPORT TEMPLATE**

The following provides the basic outline for the Evaluation Report.

### **Title Page**

- Report title, project(s) title, and contract number, Date of report, Authors and their affiliation, Locator map (if appropriate)

### **Executive Summary** (*between 2 to 4 pages*)

- Principal findings and recommendations, organised by the core, social and economic development evaluation criteria
- Summary of lessons learned

### **Acknowledgements**

### **Table of Contents**

### **List of Acronyms and Abbreviations**

### **Body of the report** (*no more than 25 pages*)

#### **A. Introduction** (max 3 pages)

- Concise presentation of the project(s) characteristics
- Purpose, objectives, and intended use of the evaluation (reference and attach the ToR as an annex)
- Evaluation methodologies and rationale for approach (reference and attach as annexes the mission itinerary; names of key informants; a list of consulted documents; and any synthesis tables containing project information used in the exercise)
- Composition of the evaluation team, including any specific roles of team members

#### **B. Project Overview** (max 5 pages)

- Concise summary of the projects' history, evolution, purpose, objectives, and strategies to achieve goals (attach theory of change and project monitoring system as annexes)
- Essential characteristics: context, underlying rationale, stakeholders and beneficiaries
- Summarise WWF's main interest in these projects

#### **C. Evaluation Findings** (3-5 pages)

- Findings organised by each of the six core evaluation criteria, including sufficient but concise rationale.
- Tables, graphics, and other figures to help convey key findings

#### **D. Recommendations** (3-5 pages)

- Recommendation organised each of the six core evaluation criteria and social and economic development criteria, including sufficient but concise rationale – recommendations should be specific, actionable and numbered.
- Projects' performance rating tables to provide a quick summary of performance and to facilitate comparison with other projects (see the Summary Table in Annex 4).

#### **E. Overall Lessons Learned** (max 3 pages)

- Lessons learned regarding what worked, what didn't work, and why
- Lessons learned with wider relevance, that can be generalised beyond the projects

#### **F. Conclusions**

- General summation of key findings and recommendations

### **Annexes**

- Terms of Reference
- Evaluation methodology detail
- Itinerary with key informants
- Documents consulted
- Projects' theory of change/ logical framework/ conceptual model/ list of primary goals and objectives (as available)
- Specific project and monitoring data, as appropriate
- Summary tables of progress towards outputs, objectives, and goals
- Maps
- Case studies / stories (~300-500 words with 1 or 2 illustrative images)
- Recommendations summary table

## B. Evaluation Plan

**COMMUNITY-BASED SUSTAINABLE  
DEVELOPMENT THROUGH COASTAL  
FISHERIES AND FINANCIAL INCLUSION IN  
SOLOMON ISLANDS AND PAPUA NEW  
GUINEA PROJECTS**

**PROJECT EVALUATION PLAN**

March 2018



# CONTENTS

- Contents..... 2
- Objectives ..... 3
- Proposed Methods ..... 3
- Evaluation steps..... 4
  - 1. review desk top reports..... 4
  - 2. Complete Interviews with non-country (WWF) staff..... 4
- SOLOMON ISLANDS ..... 4
  - 3. Complete interview with country Staff (Honiara)..... 4
  - 4. Complete interviews with key government stakeholders ..... 4
  - 5. Meet WWF Gizo Staff ..... 4
  - 6. Visit communities..... 4
  - 7. Meet Western Province Provincial Government..... 4
  - \* Review the data against WWF Evaluation Criteria..... 5
- PNG..... 5
  - 8. Complete Interview with Country Staff. .... 5
  - 9. Visit communities..... 5
  - 10. Meet Provincial Government. .... 5
  - \* Review the data against WWF Evaluation Criteria..... 5
- Limitations ..... 5
- Proposed Schedule. .... 5
- ATTACHMENT A – Draft Stakeholder list (TBC)..... 7
- ATTACHMENT B Traffic light report card – Project matrix ..... 9
- ATTACHMENT C Stakeholder Groups and relevant questions/ WWF evaluation criteria checklist.....10
- ATTACHMENT D – Interview questions.....11
- ATTACHMENT E - Evaluation Summary Table – scoring against the WWF evaluation criteria.....15
- ATTACHMENT F - Interview methods .....16

# WWF EVALUATION PLAN.

## OBJECTIVES

The primary purposes of this Evaluation Plan is to outline the methods to achieve the following objectives:

1. Assess the effectiveness of the DFAT ANCP/John West projects in achieving their stated objectives;
2. Provide recommendations on how to improve the projects and suggestions on their future direction;
3. Assess the management role of WWF-Australia and how WWF-Australia may improve their support of the projects;
4. Review the effectiveness of the WWF-NL funded “WWF-Solomon Islands Small-Scale Fisheries Rights-Based Management Programme” [aka “Strengthening Community Rights-Based Fisheries Management Program”] as a part of the WWF-Sol Is DFAT ANCP/John West projects’ review including recommendations for improvement and future directions, and the role of WWF NL.

The evaluation results will be used in WWF-Australia to support project planning meetings to be held with WWF-Sol Is and WWF-PNG in late April and early-May 2018. The results of the evaluation and the planning meetings will guide the design of Phase 3 (anticipated to be 3 years) and preparation of the FY2019 DFAT ANCP ADPlan in May-June 2018.

The WWF-NL will use the findings for future programming and, where needed, adapt their role.

## PROPOSED METHODS

The two techniques that will be used to collect data to inform the evaluation will include;

- Desk top studies of available project reports/material (as per TOR and provided by WWF); and
- Interviews with a range of project stakeholders.

Stakeholders have been identified from the list provided in the TOR, and also through a Stakeholder mapping exercise, using MCC knowledge of the Solomon Islands and PNG (Attachment A). This list is likely to expand during the course of the project.

The desk top review will initially be used to fill a traffic light matrix (Attachment B) to understand how the project has tracked against the objectives and measurement criteria (indicators). In addition to this, specific questions will be asked of stakeholder groups (Attachment C) such as those provided in the TOR (Attachment D). This information will then be used to evaluate the projects against the WWF Project Evaluation Criteria (Attachment E).

Interviews with project stakeholders will also be guided by the methods submitted in the original proposal as shown in Attachment F. These techniques were used in the 2015 evaluation and will help provide comparison of results between the evaluation dates.

The following steps are proposed for the evaluation. These may be modified during the project as more information becomes available. However any significant variation will be discussed and agreed with WWF Australia.

## **EVALUATION STEPS**

### **1. REVIEW DESK TOP REPORTS**

- Review available data to inform progress against project objectives (complete Traffic light matrix - Attachment B)
- Identify information gaps and finalise list of questions.
- Finalise stakeholder mapping exercise, interview list and questions (Attachment C and D)

### **2. COMPLETE INTERVIEWS WITH NON-COUNTRY (WWF) STAFF**

- Provide them with objectives matrix (Attachment B)
- Provide with list of key questions against WWF evaluation criteria (Attachment D)
- Update objectives matrix
- Record data against WWF criteria (Attachment E)

## **SOLOMON ISLANDS**

### **HONIARA**

#### **3. COMPLETE INTERVIEW WITH COUNTRY STAFF (HONIARA)**

- Discuss objectives matrix with Country Manager (Attachment B)
- Provide with list of key questions against WWF evaluation criteria (Attachment D)
- Update objectives matrix
- Record data against WWF criteria

#### **4. COMPLETE INTERVIEWS WITH KEY GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS**

- Provide list of relevant questions to discuss with interviewees (relevant WWF evaluation criteria (Attachment D)
- Update objectives matrix
- Record data against WWF criteria

## **GIZO**

#### **5. MEET WWF GIZO STAFF**

- Request overview of project (status) against objectives.
- Seek evidence to support WWF evaluation criteria
- Confirm trips to communities/interviews with participants/non participants?

#### **6. VISIT COMMUNITIES**

- Meet with participants (MSC, Governance etc.)
- Request informed consent
- Meet with 'non participants'.

#### **7. MEET WESTERN PROVINCE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT**

- Discuss project
- Gender
- WWF – NL project objectives.



**\* REVIEW THE INTERVIEW DATA AGAINST WWF EVALUATION CRITERIA.**

**PNG**

**MADANG/NORTH COAST**

**8. COMPLETE INTERVIEW WITH COUNTRY STAFF.**

- Request overview of projects (status) against objectives
- Discuss objectives matrix (Attachment B)
  - Provide interviewees list of key questions against WWF evaluation criteria (Attachment D)
  - Update objectives matrix
  - Record data against WWF criteria
  - Seek evidence to support WWF evaluation criteria
  - Confirm trips to communities/interviews with participants?

**9. VISIT COMMUNITIES.**

- Meet with participants Madang and North Coast (MSC, Governance etc.)
- Meet with 'non participants'.

**10. MEET PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT.**

- Discuss project
- Gender

**\* REVIEW THE DATA AGAINST WWF EVALUATION CRITERIA.**

**LIMITATIONS**

There is currently no socio- economic baseline to collect data against. Interviews will be ad hoc and not provide a quantitative measure. However a broad selection of participants will be interviewed to ensure a good representation is achieved. Any key issues will be identified and may require further investigation.

**PROPOSED SCHEDULE.**

The following schedule is proposed (Table 1). Noting that some variation may be required in-country to meet travel options and stakeholder availability.

**Table 1. Proposed project schedule and resourcing.**

Date B	LOCATION	TASK	METHOD	GS	JJ	DW
2nd March	Perth	Evaluation Plan completed.	Develop and finalise Evaluation Plan with WWF Develop interview performa (using WWF network standards criteria).	1		
9th March	Perth	Desktop review of the projects documentation (Annex 5 of TOR)	Review reports provided by WWF (drop box) to understand project objectives, timeframes and KPI's	2		
9th March		Scope field trip and organise logistics Plan and set up interviews with key informants and stakeholders in country	Book flights, accomodation, logistics Discuss with country managers about selection of community reps, contact other in country stakeholders set meetings	1		
25th March	Perth - Brisbane	Travel to Sol and PNG to complete interviews. Meet Andrew WWF Brisbane	Meet with key WWF staff in Brisbane office. If applicable. Skype Fiji and other WWF offices	1	1	
26th March	Brisbane Honiara	Travel Honiara. Meet WWF Country Manager		1	1	
27th March	Honiara	Complete interviews with Solomon Is Government and WWF Country Manager	Meet with key stakeholders in relevant offices. Record interviews for record.	1	1	
28th March (p,m)	Honiara - Gizo	Continue morning meetings in Honiara. Travel to Gizo afternoon. Meet WWF Gizo staff				
28th March	Gizo	Interview WWF Solomon field staff and WPG Officers. Interview non participants (Market Place?)		1	1	
29th March	Gizo	Travel to relvant WP communities to conduct face to face interviews.	Community to nominate representatives, from mixed stakholder groups. Ensure equal representation of male and female, and youth.	1	1	
30th March	Gizo	Travel back to Honiara and connect to PNG (JJ).	Compile key intereviews points and provide preliminary insights to WWF.	1	1	
EASTER WEND		Travel to Madang (DW)				1
3rd April	Madang	Interview PNG Gov, WWF Country staff	Meet with key stakeholders in relevant offices. Record interviews for record		1	1
4th April	lagoon community	3 days allocated for community and other stakeholder interviews	Travel to relvant WP communities to conduct face to face intereviews. Ensure equal representation of male and female, and youth.		3	3
5th April	North Coast community visits					
5th April	Return Madang					
7th April	Return PNG - Cairns		Compile key interviews points from PNG and provide preliminary insights to WWF.		1	1
23rd April	Perth	Evaluation Interim Report due	Compile all interview notes and analyse data , focus on objectives from TOR.	3	1	1
30th April		Feedback to Evaluators on Interim Report due				
8th May		Evauation Final Report	Incorportate WWF comments and finalise report	2		
		<b>TIME (DAYS)</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>

## ATTACHMENT A – DRAFT STAKEHOLDER LIST (TO BE COMPLETED)

ORGANISATION	CONTACT		COMPLETE
<b>WWF Australia</b>			
Dr Andrew Smith,	+61(0)400201001		
Nat Burke	+61(0)402305737		
Kathryn Michie	<a href="mailto:kmichie@wwf.org.au">kmichie@wwf.org.au</a>		
<b>WWF SOLOMONS</b>			
Mr Shannon Seeto	+677 28023 <a href="mailto:sseeto@wwfpacific.org">sseeto@wwfpacific.org</a>		
Ms Salome Topo, Gizo Field Project Coordinator	<a href="mailto:stopo@wwfpacific.org">(stopo@wwfpacific.org)</a>		
Ms Minnie Rafe	<a href="mailto:mrafe@wwfpacific.org">mrafe@wwfpacific.org</a> )		
Ms Dafisha Aleziru	<a href="mailto:daleziru@wwfpacific.org">daleziru@wwfpacific.org</a>		
Ms Zelda Hilly	<a href="mailto:zhilly@wwfpacific.org">zhilly@wwfpacific.org</a>		
Richard Makini, CBFM Community Conservation Officer	<a href="mailto:rmakini@wwfpacific.org">(rmakini@wwfpacific.org)</a>		
Community reps from Ghizo islands. GELCA, NECDA, KIBCA Simbo Island Megapode Women’s Savings Club Kalikongu Women’s Saving Club Non participants. <b>TBC with WWF SI.</b> (visit with community or meet in WWF office (Gizo Market day)			
<b>SOLOMON IS GOV +</b>			
Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR)	Rosalie		
MSSIF	Anna Schwarz		
Western Province Provincial Government:	<b>TBC</b>		

Provincial Fisheries Division			
National Coordinating committee (NCC)	?		
World Fish	Delvene Boso		
<b>WWF PNG</b>			
Mr Kafuri Yaro	<a href="mailto:kyaro@wwfpacific.org">kyaro@wwfpacific.org</a> ; +675 422 1337/8		
Ms Rebecca Samuel	<a href="mailto:rsamuel@wwfpacific.org">rsamuel@wwfpacific.org</a> ; +67572636675)		
Ms Belinda Chokoli, Financial Inclusion Officer	<a href="mailto:bchokoli@wwfpacific.org">bchokoli@wwfpacific.org</a> )		
Community reps from adang and Bogia/Sumkar districts, Madang Province, Papua New Guinea <b>TBC with WWF PNG</b>			
<b>PNG GOV and OTHERS</b>			
Madang Provincial Government: Provincial Fisheries			
National Development Bank, Women in Business Program & Peoples MicroBank (Madang)			
World Vision PNG/International			
Divine Word University (Business Studies Faculty)			
Tupira Surf Club?			
<b>OTHER</b>			
<b>WWF PACIFIC</b>	Ms. Kesaia Tabunakawai	679 331 5533	
	Mr Francis Areki	+679 7828065)	
<b>WWF N-L</b>	Ms Carol Phua, Senior Marine Advisor, WWF-Netherlands	<a href="mailto:cphua@wwf.nl">cphua@wwf.nl</a> )	



## ATTACHMENT C STAKEHOLDER GROUPS AND RELEVANT QUESTIONS/ WWF EVALUATION CRITERIA CHECKLIST

### WWF AUSTRALIA

Traffic light Matrix  
Quality of design  
Sustainability  
Adaptive Management  
Gender  
Economic Development  
Participation

### GOVERNMENT

Impact  
Quality of design  
Gender

### WWF COUNTRY

Traffic light Matrix  
Efficiency  
Sustainability  
Adaptive Management  
Gender  
Economic Development  
Participation

### COMMUNITY

Most Significant Change  
Efficiency (governance)  
Effectiveness  
Gender  
Economic Development  
Participation

	OBJECTIVES	RELEVANCE	DESIGN	EFFICIENCY	IMPACT	SUSTAINABILITY	ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT	GENDER	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	PARTICIPATION	OTHER	MSC
MCC	⊕	⊕					⊕		⊕		⊕	
WWF AUSTRALIA	⊕		⊕			⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕		
WWF SI/PNG	⊕			⊕		⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	⊕	
GOV			⊕		⊕			⊕				
STAKEHOLDERS												
COMMUNITY				⊕	⊕			⊕	⊕	⊕		⊕
OTHER NGO												
NON PARTICIPANTS										⊕	⊕	

## ATTACHMENT D – INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

### GUIDING QUESTIONS

#### WWF Network Program Standards' recommended evaluation criteria and guiding questions:

1. **Relevance and Quality of Design:** A measure of the extent to which the project design represents a necessary, sufficient, appropriate, and well-founded approach to bring about positive changes in the targets (e.g. species, ecosystems, ecological processes, human wellbeing).
  - 1.1. **Focal targets and related goals (species, ecosystems, ecological processes, including associated human wellbeing):** Is there a clear and relevant definition of the ultimate success in terms of improved status of the targets, including human wellbeing?
  - 1.2. **Relevance to context, priorities of stakeholders, and objectives:** Have the projects focused on and do they remain relevant to issues of highest priority?
  - 1.3. **Suitability of strategic approach:** Is the theory of change clear? Have the projects taken and will they continue to take the best, most efficient strategic approach?
  - 1.4. **Relevance to WWF priorities:** Do the projects make a clearly aligned and meaningful contribution to attaining WWF's Global Goals and Drivers?<sup>1</sup>
  - 1.5. **Relevance to WWF niche:** Given WWF's priorities and what it is most needed to do, are the projects doing what they should do?
  - 1.6. **Adherence to WWF-Australia social policies:** How well has the social context been understood by the project teams?
2. **Efficiency:** A measure of the relationship between outputs—the products or services of the intervention—and inputs—the human and financial resources the intervention uses.
  - 2.1. **Financial and administrative resources:** Are the financial and administrative resources adequate, with appropriate administrative and financial policies and practices being followed?
  - 2.2. **Use of time:** Are there thorough, well founded work plans being implemented according to plan, monitored, and adapted as necessary?
  - 2.3. **Human resources:** Are human resources appropriate, adequate, efficiently organised and operating effectively (e.g. include considerations of capacity needs and gaps, communications, division and clarity of roles and responsibilities, processes for evaluation and improvement)?
  - 2.4. **Resource use:** Are the projects delivering value for money in that costs are reasonable given the outputs and outcomes generated?
3. **Effectiveness:** A measure of the extent to which the intervention's intended outcomes—its specific objectives or intermediate results—have been achieved.
  - 3.1. **Planned result verses achievement:** Focusing on stated objectives, desired outcomes, and intermediate results (as opposed to delivery of activities and outputs), what has and has not been achieved (both intended and unintended)?
  - 3.2. **Significance of progress:** What is the significance/strategic importance of the progress—or any lack thereof—made to date? To what extent have targeted key factors—drivers, opportunities, threats—been affected to the degree they need to be to achieve the stated goals?
  - 3.3. **Factors affecting effectiveness:** Which strategies are proving to be effective, and which are not? What anticipated and unanticipated factors have promoted or impeded the projects' progress? What supporting or impeding factors might affect successful implementation in the next planning period?
  - 3.4. **Coordination and communication:** To what extent has coordination/communication been effective within and between the implementation teams, stakeholders, partners and participants? Are there well developed internal and external communications strategies being implemented to good effect (e.g. providing reach and/or spread)? What factors have hindered

---

<sup>1</sup> WWF's Global Goals and Drivers: [http://wwf.panda.org/what\\_we\\_do/how\\_we\\_work/our\\_global\\_goals/](http://wwf.panda.org/what_we_do/how_we_work/our_global_goals/)

good communication and coordination? What could be done differently to improve this?

- 3.5. **Improving effectiveness:** What lessons can be taken and applied to improve effectiveness in the coming years?
4. **Impact:** A measure of all significant effects of the conservation intervention, positive or negative, expected or unforeseen, on target issues.
- 4.1. **Evidence of change:** To what extent have the projects attained their stated goals, in terms of outcomes effecting positive change? Discuss observed impacts at all appropriate scales (local, national, regional, global, and present evidence).
- 4.2. **Attribution:** How confident can we be that perceived changes can be attributed to WWF's activities? What is the likelihood that these changes would have occurred in the absence of the projects?
- 4.3. **Unforeseen consequences:** Were there any unforeseen impacts (whether positive or negative)? Could anything have been done differently to repeat or avoid these unforeseen consequences and to have acknowledged them earlier as emerging consequences? Have the identified risks changed, or new risks emerged?
- 4.4. **Increasing impact:** How might the projects increase their impact and what would be the associated human and financial capacity needs? How was the process of increasing impact understood at the design stage (e.g. project scaling, good practice guidelines through policy change, multi-stakeholder processes) and is there evidence that this has happened or is likely to happen?
5. **Sustainability:** A measure of whether the benefits of an intervention are likely to continue after external support has ended.
- 5.1. **Evidence for sustainability:** Is there evidence that the key ingredients are being established or exist to the extent necessary to ensure the desired long-term positive impacts of the projects?
- 5.2. **Risk and mitigation:** What external factors could have a high or medium likelihood of undoing or undermining the future sustainability of the projects' positive impacts? (e.g. political stability, economic crises and shocks, overall level of development, natural disasters, climate change). Are the projects adequately anticipating and taking measures to ensure resilience to these?
- 5.3. **Exit/phase out plan:** Based upon existing plans and observations made during the evaluation, what are the key strategic options for the future of the projects (e.g. exit, scale down, replicate, scale-up, continue business-as-usual, major changes to approach)?
6. **Adaptive Capacity:** A measure of the extent to which the project applies strong adaptive management practice to ensure continued relevance, strong performance, and learning.
- 6.1. **Applying good practice:** Did the teams examine good practice lessons from other conservation/ development experiences and consider these experiences in the project designs?
- 6.2. **Monitoring of status:** Did the projects establish a baseline status of targets and key contextual factors? Is there ongoing systematic monitoring of these?
- 6.3. **Monitoring of efficiency, effectiveness, impact:**
- Did the projects track intermediate results that are part of a theory of change that clearly lay out anticipated cause-effect relationships and enable definition of appropriate indicators?
  - Is there ongoing, systematic, rigorous monitoring of output delivery, outcome attainment, and impact measurement, with plausible attribution to WWF's actions?
  - Are adequate steps taken to ensure regular reflection on efficiency, effectiveness, and impact by the project teams and partners? Is monitoring information being used to support regular adaptation of the strategic approach?
  - Are lessons documented and shared in a manner that is promoting learning by the project teams and the broader organisation?
  - What percentage of overall staff time and funding is dedicated to project monitoring, adaptation, and learning? Are there any staff positions dedicated more than half-time or full time to support these efforts?



- 6.4. **Learning:** Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted regarding what worked and didn't work (e.g. case-studies, stories, good practices)?
- 6.5. **Risk assessment:** How often were the original risks and assumptions revisited during the intervention cycle? Were the risks assessed adequately enough and were external assumptions identified realistically? How were mitigation strategies identified and responded to by the intervention teams to optimise?

### **Social and Economic Development criteria and guiding questions:**

#### **7. Gender:**

- 7.1. At the community level, have the projects had impacts on gender relations and/or the perceived roles or status of women?
- Have the workloads (both within and outside of the home) of women changed as a result of these projects? If so, how?
  - Have there been any changes in women's participation in community planning or consultation meetings, both in terms of number of women participating and the level of participation?
  - Have women been involved in financial inclusion projects taken on any other leadership roles within their communities?
  - Are men or women experiencing tensions or challenges attributed to women's participation in financial inclusion and/or CBFM components?
  - Are there any structural obstacles to women's participation that the projects have failed to account for?
- 7.2. At the government level, has there been an increase in capacity and willingness to consult with women as well as men, and to respond to women's needs and priorities?
- 7.3. At the government level, have the projects contributed to an increase in the number of women fisheries officers, or meaningful efforts to recruit/appoint/promote more female fisheries officers?
- 7.4. Overall, have practical and strategic gender interests been adequately considered in the projects' design and implementation? If so, how and to what effect? If not, why not? If not applicable, explain.
- Have the projects adequately accounted for risk of negative impacts associated with challenging traditional gender roles? Have any such risks or negative impacts been reported?
  - Have the projects been planned on the basis of a gender-differentiated beneficiaries' analysis?
  - To what extent does a gender sensitive approach contribute to improved impact of the projects?
  - What is the likeliness of increased gender equality beyond the projects' end?
  - According to the OECD Gender Policy Marker, how would you classify these projects?
  - What have been the lessons learnt, if any?

#### **8. Economic Development**

- 8.1. Have the projects increased, diversified or otherwise changed household incomes?
- 8.2. Are households more, less or equally dependent on coastal fishing than they were when the projects started?
- 8.3. Are economic benefits distributed equitably among community members, or are there notable concentrations of benefits?

#### **9. Participation**

- 9.1. Have provisions been made in the projects' designs and implementation to ensure that people with disabilities are able and encouraged to participate? What additional measures could be introduced to further enable people with disabilities to participate effectively?
- 9.2. Are there any other social groups for whom provisions have been made to facilitate participation?
- 9.3. Are there any groups that are excluded from participating in the projects? If so, why and have

efforts been made to address their exclusion?

9.4. Have the projects included the implementation and promotion of safe and discrete complaints/feedback mechanisms that are accessible to all stakeholders?

## ATTACHMENT E - EVALUATION SUMMARY TABLE – SCORING AGAINST THE WWF EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluators are to assign the project a Rating and Score for each criterion as follows:

- **Very Good/4:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *very good* extent.
- **Good/3:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *good* extent.
- **Fair/2:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *fair* extent.
- **Poor/1:** The project/programme embodies the description of strong performance provided below to a *poor* extent.
- **N/A:** The criterion was *not assessed* (in the 'Justification,' explain why).
- **D/I:** The criterion was considered but *data were insufficient* to assign a rating or score (in the 'Justification,' elaborate).

Evaluators are also to provide a brief justification for the rating and score assigned. Identify most notable strengths to build upon as well as highest priority issues or obstacles to overcome. Note that this table should not be a comprehensive summary of findings and recommendations, but an overview only. A more comprehensive presentation should be captured in the evaluation report and the management response document. Even if the report itself contains sensitive information, the table should be completed in a manner that can be readily shared with any internal WWF audience.

Criteria	Rating Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
<b>Relevance</b>		
<b>Quality of Design</b>		
<b>Efficiency</b>		
<b>Effectiveness</b>		
<b>Impact</b>		
<b>Sustainability</b>		
<b>Adaptive Management</b>		
<b>Gender</b>		
<b>Economic Development</b>		
<b>Participation</b>		

## ATTACHMENT F - INTERVIEW METHODS

Two different methods are proposed for the different stakeholder groups as part of the WWF Evaluation project. Generally for WWF staff, Government representatives and other stakeholders with strong literacy skills and those more experienced with direct surveys a 'key informant' survey approach will be used.

**Key informant interviews** are qualitative in-depth interviews with people who are exposed to the project and know what is going on in the community or country of interest. Key informant interviews have been used several times in the Solomon's by MCC for the previous WWF Evaluation (2015) as well on other projects with WorldFish, WCS and CTI. The purpose of key informant interviews is to collect information from a wide range of people—including leaders, professionals, or residents—who have first-hand knowledge about the project/country/community. These key informants, with their particular knowledge and understanding, can provide insight on the nature of problems and give recommendations for solutions.

The following are two common techniques used to conduct key informant interviews:

- *Telephone (skype) Interviews*
- *Face-to-Face Interviews*

When to conduct/use key informant interviews

- ✓ To get information about a pressing issue or problem in the community from a limited number of well-connected and informed community experts.
- ✓ To understand the motivation and beliefs of community residents on a particular issue.
- ✓ To get information from people with diverse backgrounds and opinions and be able to ask in-depth and probing questions.
- ✓ To discuss sensitive topics, get respondents' candid discussion of the topic, or to get the depth of information you need. Individual or small group discussions (two to three people maximum) create a comfortable environment where individuals can have a frank and open in-depth discussion.

For community members a different survey method is proposed '**Most Significant Change**' (MSC). This method was successfully used for the 2015 Evaluation for WWF and was also used previously by MCC & WorldFish in Gizo communities. The MSC method is based on story telling. Storytelling provides a powerful means to obtain information on a project's outcomes from participants' experiences and viewpoints. Storytelling provides meaningful information that can highlight both the strong points and weaknesses of a project, as well as any unintended consequences. In a way, by asking participants to provide a story on a project, it asks them to evaluate an aspect of a project, rather than provide information for someone else to place a value on, storytelling generally brings out memorable or momentous experiences.

MSC is a qualitative and participatory technique involving the ongoing collection of stories of significant change. MSC goes beyond merely capturing and documenting participants' stories of impact, to offering a means of engaging in effective dialogue. Each story represents the storyteller's interpretation of impact, which is then reviewed and discussed. The process offers an opportunity for a diverse range of stakeholders to enter into a dialogue about program intention, impact and ultimately future direction.

It has proven to be very successful in previous Monitoring and Evaluation in Solomon communities as relies on the 'Storying' culture of the Pacific. It provides individuals (including women and youth) and opportunity to share their insights. It can be used for one of several people at a time (often women will feel more comfortable to speak in a small group with other women). It can also be used for 'ad hoc' meetings, with a less formal or structured approach (for example at a market place etc.).

Table F1 is a short summary of the proposed methods for completing the WWF Evaluation surveys.

**Table F-1 – Summary of proposed survey methods.**

<b>STAKEHOLDER GROUP</b>	<b>PROPOSED SURVEY METHODS</b>
<p><b>WWF Staff</b></p> <p><i>Preferences – face to face</i> <i>Follow up skype/email</i></p>	<p>Seek informed prior consent Schedule suitable time, in a location that is free of distractions and allows interviewee opportunity to speak openly. Provide WWF staff with structured ‘key informant’ questions prior to interview. Prior to conducting interview give an overview of the objectives and outputs. Introduce Gillian and Michael. One to question one to scribe. Seek permission to record interview Invite the interviewee to give an overview synopsis of the work completed. Conduct interview, following prescribed questions. Explore answers. Request supporting documents. Describe next steps &amp; provide opportunity for additional comment. Thank participant.</p>
<p><b>Sol or PNG Government representative &amp; other key stakeholders</b></p> <p><i>Preferences – face to face</i> <i>Follow up skype/email</i></p>	<p>Seek informed prior consent (in consultation with WWF Country Manager) Schedule suitable time, in a location convenient to them, which is free of distractions and allows interview opportunity to speak openly (no WWF staff present). Provide interviewee with structured questions prior to interview. Prior to conducting interview give an overview of the objectives and outputs. Introduce Gillian and Michael. One to question one to scribe. Seek permission to record interview Invite the interviewee to give an overview of their involvement/understanding of the IFAD projects (what is their relationship). Conduct interview, following prescribed questions. Explore answers. Request supporting documents. Describe next steps &amp; provide opportunity for additional comment. Thank participant.</p>
<p><b>Community members (recipient FAD)</b></p> <p><i>Essential face to face I</i></p>	<p>Seek informed prior consent (in consultation with WWF Country Manager) – through written letter to community head. With WWF country staff request communities to nominate 10 x representatives for participation in process. This is to include at least 4 women and 2 youths. Arrange a time suitable to communities (when they are do not have prior commitments like gardening/fishing/church demands etc.) Ask communities to nominate location suitable for them. WWF have contact community contact points (working groups) who can Schedule suitable time, in a location convenient to them, which is free of distractions and allows interview opportunity to speak openly (no WWF staff present).</p> <p>However, in some instances it may be better to have a WWF staff member present, who has a good connection with the community to take part on interviews, particularly for any gender issue interviews. They may be able to help prompt questions.</p>

	<p>Introduce self and explain objective of 'interview/story' Seek permission to record interview Invite the interviewee to give an overview of their involvement/understanding of the IFAD projects (what is their relationship). Conduct interview/MSO process, using guidelines questions only Explore answers. Request permission to take supporting photographs. Describe next steps &amp; provide opportunity for additional comment. Thank participant.</p>
--	---

## C. Case studies / stories

## Solomon Islands

### Case Study 1 The story of Erika (President of the SIMBO Island Megapode Women Savings club)

Erika comes from SIMBO, she is married and has 6 children, and 6 grandchildren.

She has been a member of the SIMBO Island Megapode Women Savings club since it was established in 2016. She is now the President.

WWF has provided micro financing training (including leadership training, governance and financial administration) to the Association. The women have collectively been able to save \$70,000 SBD in two years.

Since being part of the micro finance project Erika (and her the women in her community) feel empowered, through knowledge learning.

*“WWF hemi nice tumas, helpim mifala for opening mind blow mi”*

The men in the community are also very supportive of the micro savings scheme.

The community are interested in learning about how they can use their own savings to set up loans for small businesses, and also to help support CBRM.



*Erika with WWF staff Salome and Dafisha*



## Case Study 2: The Ijo-Maringi Association and CBFM

The Ijo-Maringi Association is highly engaged and ready to implement effective management. They have shown initiative with establishing seaweed monitoring and harvest closures, only opening when there is abundant seaweed.

WWF staff facilitated an Association meeting in the village to discuss the SPS data and possible management decisions. Over 30 participants attended the meeting. They discussed an EAFM approach to fisheries management (their resources). That is there was recognition by the Association members that protecting habitats, managing threats like plastic, doing awareness with the community, and compliance all link together. There was also discussion about the importance of protecting spawning sites, and Crown of Thorns (COTs) control.

There were positive discussions about possible rules for management (e.g. open and closed areas) and how widely those rules should be applied and what type of compliance might be required. There was also lengthy debate about implementing size limits or a full ban on selected species.

WWF staff raised the potential options for linking microfinance (savings groups) with conservation actions, and gave examples such as a portion of savings being allocated for monitoring or management actions, or supporting Community Facilitators. This was fairly well received.

This demonstrated an engaged, informed and active community who are working closely with WWF to implement EAFM at a local level.



*The Ijo-Maringi Association members participating in the EAFM workshop with WWF*



*WWF staff Zelda (CBFM Officer) and Salome (Microfinance) at the The Ijo-Maringi Association meeting room, and during the WWF presentation.*





*One of the female The Ijo-Maringi Association members sharing her positive experiences with MCC Environmental Project Evaluator.*

# PNG

## CASE STUDY 1: NORTH COAST COMMUNITY FACILITATORS

### Matthew Mirak, Sarar village & Kevin Siwor, Toto village (Bogia District)

Matthew Mirak is the original Community Facilitator from Sarar village in the north coast of Madang and has been involved in the project since 2016. He has been responsible for selecting many of the other Community Facilitators and chooses individuals who understand fishing, can speak in public and are respected in their community. He received training in the SPS method in 2016 and collects data from catches in his community on a weekly basis. He believes the surveys have been key in providing evidence that people are catching immature fish, even if fishers have noticed themselves that they are catching smaller and smaller fish. The SPS data has calculated a 'size at maturity' for rabbitfish and through two years of data collection, Matthew has determined the spawning season for rabbitfish.

Sarar has now established a Fisheries Management Committee who will meet to agree on local management actions for their marine area, potentially including a tambu area (1 km x 500 m) and future size limits in fishing areas. WWF has provided support for the Community Facilitators, Chiefs and leaders to understand the issues and put conservation measures in place. Engagement and awareness are key to getting community agreement on management actions, and once there are management measures in place, some monitoring will be needed to show to communities that they are working to protect fish and habitats, particularly non-extractive methods for tambu areas.

Kevin Siwor is a Community Facilitator for SPS monitoring as well as an agent for the village savings group in Toto village. Kevin agreed that even though fishers know that fish are getting harder to catch and are smaller, they need evidence. Kevin and his family plan to also put a small tambu area in place in their family's marine area and believe that people will respect tambu law but it will be difficult to have rules (e.g. size limits) in areas open to fishing, despite the evidence from SPS. Both Matthew and Kevin strongly advocate for alternative food and income options, otherwise people will keep fishing and will keep catching immature fish. While chickens and pigs are a potential option, they believe that fishing will always be the favoured source as it is free, so iFADs are an important alternative.

The role of Community Facilitators in awareness raising is critical, and visual aids and professional behaviour are needed. A range of awareness tools, such as videos and stories from elders, will help reach a broad audience in communities and nearby villages that already work together to discuss marine issues. The benefits of increased awareness due to the project have been noticed, for example, in Sarar, a resource centre was built to house the Community Facilitators meetings and other WWF-led activities. This resource centre is now a focal place in the village and important for coming together to discuss marine issues and management options, including meetings of the Fisheries Management Committee. Long-term sustainability of the project activities will depend on the commitment of Community Facilitators and being able to demonstrate benefits to the communities, such as the resource centre or improved fish catches in areas where management has been implemented. The strong traditional leadership and respected leaders in Sarar and Toto will also help support continuation of activities beyond the life of the project.



*Matthew and Kevin (North Coast Community Facilitators) sharing their story with Johanna Johnson.*

## CASE STUDY 2: MADANG LAGOON COMMUNITY FACILITATORS

### Rovina Tolal, Limui Misken & Cathy Pat, Kranget Island (Ambenob LLG)

Limui Misken has been involved with WWF projects since 2009, including the climate change program, mangrove rehabilitation project and iFAD component of this project. Rovina and Cathy have been involved with the WWF project since 2016, when they received training on the microfinancing and personal viability. All three women are agents for the financial inclusion component of the project.

The training that has been provided by WWF under this project, particularly the personal viability, money management and household budgeting, has provided new knowledge to members on how to plan for the future. The project has been very inclusive of women, men and children in all villages where there have been village savings groups established, and after the initial 6-month pilot phase, interest in joining the village savings and loan association (VSL) has increased. On Kranget, the 6 pilot groups have increased to 12 groups with an average of 16-18 members per group.

The microfinancing has helped people to learn about saving so they don't need to go out and fish when school fees or other bills are due. It has also bolstered the confidence of women who have become Community Facilitators (agents) and supported disadvantaged groups, such as single mothers and youth. For example, the VSL gave a loan to a high school youth to start a phone recharge small business that was successful and he paid off the loan. The profits from that business plus a second loan helped him start up a marine fuel business that is ongoing and the second loan has been paid too.

The training provided has also been important for raising awareness about marine issues, including the importance of communities looking after their ocean and working together to plan for the future. While awareness is high and there is willingness to change, unless there are alternatives, such as iFADs, people will continue to fish. More training on marine resource management and alternative food and income options would help communities make decisions about their resources. Continued awareness raising among communities is very important if positive change in fishing behaviours are to be achieved.





*Rovina Total, Limui Miskén & Cathy Pat at Kranget Island (Ambenob LLG)*

### CASE STUDY 3: MADANG LAGOON COMMUNITY FACILITATORS

#### **Bonny Wadui & Angela Wadui, Riwo village; Mager Gidik, Bilia Island**

Bonny and Angela Wadui became involved in the WWF project in 2016 as microfinance Community Facilitators (agents) and Mager is a Community Facilitator for both microfinancing and monitoring. They all agreed that the training provided for the VSL was new and helped them to realise the importance of planning for the future. Support in their villages has continued to grow since the 6-month trial phase and more groups are forming and members joining, with some applying for loans to purchase items for their market stalls so they can earn more money.

They agreed that by having income from new businesses, people can fish less and will buy their food from the local markets. However, there will always be a need for fish, and the most successful alternative was the iFADs when they were operational. They took the pressure off the reef and provided food and income, particularly in Bilia Island where there is limited land for gardens or any other alternative food sources.

The future of the project should continue to support the VSL as they are very important in communities for providing income opportunities. Communities also need more training on fisheries management as they know there are problems, but any rules for improving sustainability will only be possible once there are alternatives in place, like iFADs. The design of the iFADs could be improved to minimise issues from last deployments. Communities also need monitoring that they can do to see if their local fisheries management is working.



*Bonny Wadui & Angela Wadui, Riwo village; Mager Gidik, Bilia Island*